



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
26 June 2013

Original: English

---

## Human Rights Council

Twenty-fourth session

Agenda items 2 and 3

**Annual report of the United Nations High Commissioner  
for Human Rights and reports of the Office of the  
High Commissioner and the Secretary-General**

**Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil,  
political, economic, social and cultural rights,  
including the right to development**

## **Views of States, national human rights institutions and other relevant stakeholders on the target sectors, focus areas or thematic human rights issues for the third phase of the World Programme for Human Rights Education**

### **Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights**

#### *Summary*

The present report is submitted pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 21/14, entitled “World Programme for Human Rights Education”, operative paragraph 6.

It summarizes contributions and views expressed by States, national human rights institutions and other relevant stakeholders on the possible target sectors, focus areas or thematic human rights issues for the third phase of the World Programme for Human Rights Education. These contributions were received until 3 May 2013 in the context of a consultation launched on 1 February 2013 by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.

The feedback received has shown a diversity of approaches and priorities among the respondents, often reflecting national and regional contexts; some global patterns and general conclusions are presented at the end of the report.

A majority of the respondents has emphasized the need to continue prioritizing human rights education with the target sectors already identified in the previous phases, i.e. the formal education system – primary, secondary and higher education – as well as training for civil servants, law enforcement officials and the military. These respondents have mentioned gaps with regard to the development of comprehensive and sustainable implementation strategies and action plans not only in the context of the World Programme, but also in light of the proclamation of the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training in December 2011. Respondents have highlighted the need to advance implementation where no significant action has taken place and to consolidate the work done, to undertake related research and map and share good practices and lessons learned, to sharpen education and training methodologies and approaches based on proven good practice, and to foster dialogue between duty bearers and civil society. In this context, a target group which featured prominently in the responses as needing additional and focussed attention was the one constituted by teachers and educators, including professionals in the formal education system and those active in non-formal settings.

New possible target audiences highlighted by respondents were media professionals, civil society organizations and youth, including youth movements and organizations, as well as specific groups of rights holders, in particular persons with disabilities, minorities and indigenous peoples, and women victims of violence. In terms of thematic areas, the most recurrent topics included non-discrimination and equality, with particular reference to discrimination and violence against women and girls; and education to promote active citizenship and participation with a view to strengthening democracy, good governance and global citizenship.

---

## Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction .....	1–9	4
II. Responses from Governments .....	10–26	5
III. Responses from national human rights institutions .....	27–43	7
IV. Responses from international and regional intergovernmental organizations .....	44–49	11
V. Responses from civil society .....	50–68	12
A. Responses from individual non-governmental organizations .....	50–62	12
B. Responses from other sources .....	63–64	14
C. Report of the Global Human Rights Education Listserv consultation .....	65–68	14
VI. Conclusions .....	69–78	14

## I. Introduction

1. The Human Rights Council, in resolution 21/14, requested the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) to consult with States, national human rights institutions and other relevant stakeholders on the possible target sectors, focus areas or thematic human rights issues for the third phase of the World Programme for Human Rights Education and to submit a report thereon to the Council at its twenty-fourth session. The present report is submitted accordingly.

2. On 1 February 2013, OHCHR sent a request to Member States, national human rights institutions and other relevant stakeholders for their views and contributions. The consultation was also announced on the OHCHR website. On 8 February 2013, Human Rights Education Associates (HREA), an international non-governmental organization (NGO), together with the NGO Working Group on Human Rights Education and Learning of the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations in Consultative Relationship with the United Nations (CoNGO), launched a related online consultation through the Global Human Rights Education Listserv, an electronic network of over 10,000 individuals and organizations interested in human rights education.

3. By 3 May 2013, 54 responses to OHCHR request had been received, including 17 replies from Governments, 17 from national human rights institutions, 6 from international and regional intergovernmental organizations, 13 from NGOs and 1 from an academic institution. Additionally, HREA and the above-mentioned Working Group sent a report of the online consultation summarizing 41 contributions from 19 countries. Five individuals also replied.

4. The present report summarizes all the information received and makes some concluding remarks on the basis of suggestions received. The summaries focus on the specific request by the Human Rights Council concerning the third phase, and do not provide detailed information on human rights programmes and issues, which were sometimes extensively reported by respondents.

5. The Governments of the following Member States replied: Argentina; Armenia; Azerbaijan; Bahrain; Bosnia and Herzegovina; Costa Rica; Estonia; Guatemala; Italy; Lao People's Democratic Republic; Lithuania; Namibia; Portugal; Romania; Serbia; Sudan; and Uruguay.

6. The following national human rights institutions replied: Australian Human Rights Commission; Commission for Human Rights and Good Governance of Tanzania; Commission nationale des droits de l'homme du Rwanda; Commissioner for Fundamental Rights of Hungary; Danish Institute for Human Rights; Defensoría del Pueblo de Colombia; Defensoría del Pueblo de la República de Panamá; German Institute for Human Rights (Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte); Human Rights Commissioner of the Republic of Azerbaijan; Instituto Nacional de Derechos Humanos de Chile; Irish Human Rights Commission; National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia; National Human Rights Committee of Qatar; New Zealand Human Rights Commission; Ombudsman of Portugal; Republic of Albania People's Advocate; and South African Human Rights Commission.

7. The following international and regional intergovernmental organizations also replied: European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights; Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe; Organization of American States; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East; and World Meteorological Organization.

8. As far as civil society is concerned, the following NGOs replied: Agence de diffusion du droit international humanitaire en Afrique Centrale; Amnesty International Austria; Association Points-Coeur; Center for Citizenship Education, Slovenia; Cyprus Human Rights Centre; Democracy and Human Rights Education in Europe; Human Rights Education Associates; Human Rights Education USA; Institute of Human Rights of the National Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan; Netherlands Platform on Human Rights Education; New Humanity; Soka Gakkai International; and U.S. Fund for UNICEF. Wuhan University School of Law (China) also replied, as well as five individuals.

9. It is recalled that the first phase (2005–2009) of the World Programme for Human Rights Education (2005–ongoing) was dedicated to the integration of human rights education into the primary and secondary school systems, and the second phase (2010–2014) focuses on human rights education in higher education and human rights training for teachers and educators, civil servants, law enforcement officials and military personnel. Civil servants, “depending on national laws and governmental structures, may include officials and policymakers from government ministries and departments, diplomats, teachers, employees of local government and municipalities as well as fiscal and economic agencies, public health professionals and social workers”.<sup>1</sup>

## II. Responses from Governments

10. The Government of **Argentina** provided an extensive response prepared as a cooperative effort among various governmental actors and other institutions. It indicated, as suggested target sectors for the third phase, law enforcement officials, security and military forces, and civil servants as well as municipalities, the provincial government and the general public, to reach out to the grass-roots level. With respect to thematic areas, it highlighted the need to reflect on human rights violations during the past military dictatorship, in particular with a view to empowering students and youth to become political actors; the revision of school textbooks to combat stereotypes concerning vulnerable groups; the prevention of institutional violence and torture, social violence, in particular in sports, and gender-based violence. The response further provided information on human rights education initiatives undertaken by different national actors.

11. The Government of **Armenia** stated that the focus sectors of the first and second phases of the World Programme should also be targeted in the third phase, as related work has not yet been completed. Armenia mentioned the following thematic areas for the third phase: human rights and protection mechanisms at the national and international levels; rights and responsibilities; genocide education; international human rights law; environmental education; gender education; and electoral law. In terms of target sectors, it listed rural community members; local self-government bodies, State and civil servants, and workers from the private sector; law enforcement officials; communities and NGOs; secondary schools and preschools; higher education institutions; journalists; vulnerable groups including people with disabilities; decision makers; and the business sector. Strategies proposed for the third phase include teacher training in cooperation with pedagogical universities; development of resources centres and information material; governmental support to NGOs’ projects; development of new methodologies including distance learning; peer review among countries; establishment of monitoring and evaluation systems; and the incorporation of human rights education commitments into domestic law. The third phase should last 10 years, from 2015 to 2024.

<sup>1</sup> See OHCHR, *World Programme for Human Rights Education, Second Phase, Plan of Action*, New York and Geneva, 2012, paragraph 37.

12. The Government of **Azerbaijan** transmitted the proposals of the Human Rights Commissioner of the Republic of Azerbaijan and of the Institute of Human Rights of the National Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan. These will be mentioned in the sections below concerning responses from national human rights institutions and civil society respectively.

13. The Government of **Bahrain** highlighted the importance of considering human rights education as a learning process facilitating active participation aimed at solving problems related to students' lives and at identifying human rights concerns and priorities for the community and society. Highlighted focus issues for the third phase are peaceful coexistence and appreciation of diversity, as well as democracy and related methods of decision-making. Among proposed strategies are the integration of relevant values, concepts and skills in curricula and textbooks; training of trainers; human resources development, including training for teachers, managers, parents, media and lawyers; and development of materials, including web design.

14. The Government of **Bosnia and Herzegovina** indicated as target sectors for the third phase the formal education and civil service sectors. It suggested as thematic areas the prohibition of discrimination, particularly with regard to the right to education, and a focus on the training of teachers working with children belonging to minorities, migrant families and children with disabilities.

15. The Government of **Costa Rica** recommended focusing on administration of justice officials, particularly judges, prosecutors and magistrates. In terms of specific themes, Costa Rica suggested the principle of equality and non-discrimination with regard to specific groups.

16. The Government of **Estonia** stressed that there is a continuous need for educating groups that have been already targeted in the previous phases, i.e. teachers and other education personnel, school leaders and social workers. Other target groups could include leaders of youth organizations, journalists and other media personnel. Estonia suggested as a thematic priority the identification of human rights violations in everyday life and possible intervention strategies.

17. The Government of **Guatemala** presented a report concerning human rights education initiatives undertaken in the context of the World Programme for Human Rights Education, including the adoption of the national plan of action for human rights education in 2007 and its implementation. Guatemala proposed that the third phase could focus on a culture of peace to promote tolerance, solidarity and respect for individual and collective rights; conflict resolution and transformation, to sensitize local authorities in particular; and institutional capacity-building to ensure compliance of States with international human rights obligations. Focus target groups could include civil servants, community leaders and the general public.

18. The Government of **Italy** highlighted the importance of stakeholders such as NGOs from various sectors, academia and mass media, including the Internet and social networks. Italy considered as a key priority the issue of freedom of religion or belief and interreligious and intercultural dialogue in order to foster mutual understanding and peaceful coexistence. It also expressed its commitment to human rights education and training, in particular with reference to its related work in the context of the Human Rights Council.

19. The Government of the **Lao People's Democratic Republic** proposed concentrating on empowering women to be leaders in higher, technical and vocational education.

20. The Government of **Lithuania** recommended as a possible focus for the third phase the elimination and prevention of violence against women and girls, particularly domestic violence. In this regard, specific target sectors could be professionals (e.g. police, judges,

investigators and social workers) dealing with violence issues or providing assistance and support to victims.

21. The Government of **Namibia** suggested that, in light of the proposed International Decade for People of African Descent, a target sector could be people of African descent and in particular their right to development and their economic, social and cultural rights.

22. The Government of **Portugal** proposed that the third phase focus on economic, social and cultural rights, as it identified a lack of knowledge in this area at the national level, and considered this to be also a general trend internationally. As specific target sectors, Portugal suggested national human rights institutions, public prosecutors, judges, lawyers and members of NGOs, bearing in mind their role in promoting a better understanding and the justiciability of those rights. It also mentioned as a target audience civil servants, to ensure that public policies are embedded with a greater human rights focus. Portugal added that previous efforts concerning the school systems should continue, extending them to preschool and including in the school curricula economic, social and cultural rights and in particular the fight against poverty and social inclusion; a focus could be on training of teachers, trainers and other education professionals. It also highlighted the importance of training policymakers, legislators, media professionals, NGOs and local communities' institutions. Specific thematic areas could include the fight against discrimination and social inequalities; the promotion of safe learning environments; and the social responsibility of the media.

23. The Government of **Romania** suggested targeting students and teachers of primary and secondary schools, with a thematic focus on human rights and children's rights through non-formal education and extracurricular activities, as well as influential actors able to promote public awareness of democratic citizenship and human rights.

24. The Government of the Republic of **Serbia** suggested that the third phase should focus on human rights training for the judiciary, in particular on domestic application of ratified international human rights treaties.

25. The Government of **Sudan** proposed as target groups the media, human rights defenders and victims of trafficking. Thematic areas could include freedom of opinion and expression, rights and limitations; the role of the media in the promotion and protection of human rights; and socioeconomic rights and trafficking in persons.

26. The Government of **Uruguay** suggested as target sectors people with limited access to their rights, particularly the poor as well as adolescents, young people and adults involved in non-formal and formal education, and human rights defenders, including educators. Themes that could be addressed are the universality of human rights as a condition for affirming specific identities and respect for diversity; access to quality public education for children and youth from excluded social layers, to facilitate their social integration; and the identification of human rights violations in the institutional practices of democratic institutions, considered a less visible but recurrent phenomenon.

### **III. Responses from national human rights institutions**

27. The **Australian Human Rights Commission** underscored the need to continue implementation of human rights education within the sectors highlighted during the first and second phases of the World Programme, considering the challenges that still remain at the national level; in this regard, the Commission offered its perspectives regarding the Australian context. In addition, the Commission advocated for the following options as focus areas for the third phase: human rights and the Internet; business and human rights;

indigenous rights; human rights of asylum seekers; and human rights and the environment, particularly with regard to the impact of climate change.

28. The **Commission for Human Rights and Good Governance of Tanzania** proposed that the third phase address professionals in governmental and non-governmental institutions such as parliamentarians, policy- and decision makers, journalists, members of NGOs, social workers, doctors and nurses, and community leaders. The Commission stressed the importance for African countries to have knowledgeable professionals, in particular decision makers and those dealing directly with people at the grass-roots level like medical personnel, able to develop policies and practices in line with human rights principles. Moreover, the Commission suggested focusing on human rights education for children and young adults outside the formal school system, e.g. street children, working children, homeless children and young adults, as they are the most neglected and vulnerable individuals and their number is constantly growing worldwide, and especially in Africa.

29. The **Commission nationale des droits de l'homme du Rwanda** referred to developments at the national level related to human rights education in the context of the first and second phases of the World Programme. For the third phase, the Commission proposed to focus on lawmakers, decision makers, law enforcement officials, prosecutors, mass media professionals and prison officers. Within the formal education systems, the Commission highlighted the need to focus on primary students as well as primary and secondary school headmasters and curriculum developers, and to extend human rights education in higher education for faculties beyond law faculties. It also proposed as target audience the general public, establishing a human rights week to promote tolerance, peace and a culture of human rights. Thematically, the Commission proposed an emphasis on combating torture and domestic violence; the right to development and environmental rights; democracy, civil liberties and human rights, including the right to justice; human rights and the media; good governance and human rights; and international trade and human rights.

30. The **Commissioner for Fundamental Rights of Hungary** welcomed the World Programme as a framework to enhance awareness of human rights and specifically the rights of the child, which have been the Ombudsman's priority since 2008. Based on national experience and two surveys undertaken in 2011 and 2012, the Commissioner recommended that the third phase focus on non-discrimination and the rights of the child, for health-care professionals, alternative childcare professionals and actors of the justice system (judges, lawyers, prosecutors, policemen, psychologists), with particular attention to issues pertaining to children who belong to minorities or other vulnerable groups.

31. The **Danish Institute for Human Rights** reported a limited impact of the first two phases on the Danish educational system, due to a lack of prioritization by the Government and other official stakeholders. Accordingly, the Institute proposed a focus on securing the value and quality of the previous phases. In this context, it highlighted the need to build bridges between formal, informal and non-formal education sectors, exploring how they can complement and support each other, and mapping and sharing of best practices and lessons learned. In addition, the Institute recommended that the third phase focus on promoting implementation of the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training, especially at the governmental level, with a view to transforming the Declaration into a legally binding instrument during the third phase.

32. The **Defensoría del Pueblo de Colombia** highlighted the role of human rights education in addressing global challenges including unemployment and lack of labour guarantees and legislation; the social impact of new technologies and of non-sustainable development; natal and maternal mortality and endemic illnesses due to the limited availability of social security and public health assistance; discrimination and violence against women, particularly in conflict, and domestic violence; the deepening of social and



economic inequalities; and racial and other discrimination. Accordingly, the third phase could target government officials in particular, as well as those involved in armed conflicts including victims, communities and military personnel. Thematically, the Defensoría proposed a focus on education against discrimination and for peaceful coexistence; human rights education and citizenship, participation and democracy; victims and their right to truth, justice and reparation; and empowerment of women and vulnerable groups, including indigenous peoples.

33. The **Defensoría del Pueblo de la República de Panamá** noted that training of the target sectors of the previous phases should continue and be institutionalized. The Defensoría proposed targeting, for the third phase, national security agents (e.g. police and border guards) and prison officials, with a focus on human rights and democracy, national security and deprivation of liberty, as well as on youth in general.

34. The **German Institute for Human Rights** welcomed the third phase of the World Programme and stated that it is essential to consolidate the work undertaken during the first and second phases. Ongoing activities should be continued accordingly, with the empowerment of vulnerable groups and the development of barrier-free and inclusive programmes as cross-cutting strategies.

35. The **Human Rights Commissioner of the Republic of Azerbaijan** proposed that the third phase promote a culture of peace, cultural rights and collective rights in general; education of elderly people, refugees and internally displaced persons and persons with disabilities; human rights education in secondary schools; the establishment of specific human rights centres and networks under national institutions and the strengthening of available resources; training on HIV/AIDS-related human rights issues; gender education; training for government officials, media and NGOs; and support to the elaboration of new education methodologies based on best practices, and to the publication of legal and training materials.

36. The **Instituto Nacional de Derechos Humanos de Chile** welcomed the forthcoming third phase, mentioning that the two previous phases had achieved their objectives only partially, with limited governmental action in a national context characterized by citizens' distrust of politics and public institutions and low levels of social and political participation. As a result, the Institute considered necessary the strengthening of objectives and priorities related to the first and second phases, in particular the training of teachers, civil servants, law enforcement officials and military, as well as other professionals; it underlined the importance of developing a national action plan for human rights education as a common platform for actors in the Government and education. The Institute suggested a period of evaluation of the first two phases before the third phase began; a third phase to target young people (18 to 30 years old), in order to foster their active citizenship, as well as legislators, policymakers and the mass media. The third phase should focus on the strengthening of democracy through education for active citizenship and the use of democratic mechanisms to further human rights.

37. The **Irish Human Rights Commission** stressed the need for continuity between the second and third phases, given the size of the second phase's target sectors and their diverse human rights education needs, the absence of national human rights education plans in many countries, and the insufficient five-year timeframe for systematic and meaningful institutionalization of human rights education. Accordingly, the Commission suggested that the third phase focus on the target sectors of the second phase, with the addition of the judiciary and an emphasis on health and local authorities. States should be called upon to develop sustainable national human rights education action plans, including the provision of adequate resources. OHCHR should take stock of progress made so far. The Commission's recommendations were followed by an account of recent human rights

education efforts in Ireland, as detailed in the 2011 report of the Commission entitled *Human Rights Education in Ireland – An Overview*.

38. The **National Human Rights Commission of Mongolia** reported on its human rights education activities and suggested, for the third phase of the World Programme, to focus on training concerning labour rights as well as business and human rights in the private sector, in the light of existing human rights abuses by employers. It also proposed a focus on the inclusion of human rights curricula in faculties other than law schools, such as medicine, political and social sciences and pedagogy, to enhance human rights knowledge and skills among the future human resources of the public sector.

39. The **National Human Rights Committee of Qatar** reported on human rights education progress at the national level since 2006, particularly the steps taken by national actors to develop an action plan aimed at promoting a culture of human rights, in particular through the formal education system.

40. The **New Zealand Human Rights Commission** referred to its previous report (May 2012) on implementation of the World Programme and highlighted the lack of a systematic nationwide strategy for human rights education. In this regard, the Commission suggested that, during the third phase, opportunities for dialogue between civil society and duty bearers identified in the previous phases should be pursued, with the purpose of embedding and expanding the progress made to date. In terms of focus areas, the Commission proposed economic, social and cultural rights, in particular health and education, to expand duty bearers' understanding of the responsibility to progressively realize these rights. Alternatively, the Commission proposed focusing on emerging international human rights standards such as those related to persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples and sexual orientation and gender identity; with regard to the school systems, the third phase could address how to deal with violence, abuse and bullying through a human rights approach. Finally, the Commission highlighted the importance of developing and using effective methodologies for human rights education, as an ongoing focus of the World Programme.

41. The **Ombudsman of Portugal** put forward, as a priority issue, the human rights of elderly persons, given the absence of specific related international instruments and the increasing relevance of this matter in society. Relevant target audiences could be not only the general public but also public and private entities working directly with elderly people, such as social services, police, local authorities and homes for the elderly.

42. The **Republic of Albania People's Advocate** deemed that a priority focus for the third phase could be the protection and the empowerment of vulnerable categories such as minorities, women victims of violence, victims of human trafficking, persons with special needs, the poor, the LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender) community, the Roma community and people affected by "blood feuds". Following the Albanian experience, target audiences for related educational programmes could be, among others, central and local institutions, civil society, religious communities and the media, as well as individuals belonging to those groups.

43. The **South African Human Rights Commission** proposed promoting the rights of women and girls among the general public, with a focus on gender- and sexual-based violence. The Commission stated that this issue is a priority for the region, which has the highest proportions of violence against women and girls (i.e. rape, forced marriage, domestic violence and murder), in addition to a high prevalence of HIV.

#### IV. Responses from international and regional intergovernmental organizations

44. The **European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights** offered the results of a European consultation carried out in 2009 to map the status and assess institutional needs in the area of human rights education. The consultation highlighted key gaps: the lack of training support to human rights defenders and minority groups; human rights training for the police being a stand-alone component at the basic training stage, with limited critical integration into broader police training and ongoing professional development; a low level of awareness of human rights in the health-care system; and the need for educational interventions to improve access to legal systems mainly directed at legal professionals, for them to become more aware of, and responsive to, the specific barriers, issues and needs of different sections of society.

45. The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights) of the **Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe** (OSCE) suggested that the third phase could focus on three areas: first, the rights of persons with disabilities, with human rights education initiatives targeting them but also State institutions responsible for enforcing those rights, such as local authorities, educational authorities at all levels and law enforcement officials; secondly, women's rights and violence against women, which represents a pressing problem across the OSCE region and has far-reaching implications for women's inclusion in society; and thirdly, the rights of migrants, targeting this group as well as national immigration authorities.

46. The **Organization of American States** (OAS) considered that, in addition to the target sectors of the previous phases, the third phase could focus on leaders and members of civil society organizations involved in human rights education, education for democratic citizenship, youth and/or building a culture of peace; on professionals and companies in the business sector working on corporate social responsibility; on mass media, not only to contribute to a better quality of information, but also for their educational work; and on donors involved in international cooperation, to promote efficient investment of available resources. In terms of thematic areas, in particular with regard to children and youth, the OAS referred to school coexistence, with a view to preventing violence in schools; transparency and integrity, to combat corruption; the use of arts and the media as essential tools for promoting creativity, self-esteem, integration and social cohesion; and economic and financial issues related to the exercise of economic, social and cultural rights.

47. The **United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization** (UNESCO) highlighted the need to maintain a focus, for the third phase, on teachers and educators in non-formal education. It also highlighted the need to address early childhood education and community-based adult education to reach out to parents and family members, as research shows that children's experiences before starting primary school shape their attitudes, values, behaviours, habits, skills and identity throughout life. UNESCO also pointed out, as possible target audiences, youth and vulnerable groups including women, persons with disabilities and migrants. Regarding thematic areas, UNESCO proposed the development of competencies in respect of human rights values and principles, suggesting a focus on pedagogy; economic, social and cultural rights in relation to the post-2015 agenda; social inclusion, emphasizing the issue of culturally-appropriate content and teaching methods; civil and political participation, particularly addressing young people; the rights of the child, in particular in early childhood; and the right of literacy as an integral part of the right to education. In addition, UNESCO suggested that the third phase should build upon the previous phases of the World Programme and foster a global review of action taken so far, with the purpose of highlighting opportunities and progress made, as well as remaining gaps and challenges. Furthermore, the World

Programme could be linked to and benefit from various international initiatives such as Learning Metrics Task Force, which seeks to define learning outcomes for early childhood education, and the ongoing dialogue concerning the post-2015 education agenda.

48. The **United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA)** referred to its work during the first and second phases of the World Programme, the challenges faced and the lessons learned. For the third phase, UNRWA proposed a focus on human rights education tailored to the girl child and specifically addressing gender discrimination; the rights of persons with disabilities; and reaching out to youth, both in formal and informal settings.

49. The **World Meteorological Organization** suggested that the third phase address civil society at large on thematic human rights issues such as access to food, water and energy, and protection against natural hazards under a changing climate, in view of the urgent need to increase the capacity and resilience of societies to adapt to climate changes, which put at risk socioeconomic systems.

## V. Responses from civil society

### A. Responses from individual non-governmental organizations

50. The **Agence de diffusion du droit international humanitaire en Afrique Centrale**, taking particularly into consideration African countries, suggested a focus on teachers, particularly those dealing with civic education, as well as law enforcement officers and military personnel, lawyers and the general public, through public awareness and media campaigns. Thematically, efforts should concentrate on civil and political rights, considering their recurrent violation in the African context, without neglecting economic and social rights.

51. **Amnesty International Austria** recommended concentrating on further strengthening the institutionalization and sustainability of human rights education at all levels of formal education, from preschool to higher education, particularly teacher training institutions. It also addressed the need to strengthen non-formal human rights education, by targeting youth movements, youth workers, social workers and community organizers, among others. A cross-cutting need in this area is the development of sound human rights education methodologies.

52. The **Association Points-Coeur** considered that the third phase should target the mass media and journalists, in view of their influence in shaping the culture of a society and people's minds.

53. The **Center for Citizenship Education** of Slovenia suggested a focus on non-formal and formal adult education, especially addressing vulnerable groups of citizens (e.g. the elderly, socially excluded people and persons with disabilities). It also suggested a focus on the development of active citizenship abilities as well as key competencies and strategies to deal with hostile environments.

54. The **Cyprus Human Right Centre** highlighted limitations in Cyprus regarding human rights education.

55. **Democracy and Human Rights Education in Europe** consulted its 53 member organizations in Europe and recommended that the third phase address adult learners and adult learning providers, as well as youth organizations and NGOs as providers of non-formal education, with a view to empowering individuals and groups to claim their rights. It

further suggested, as thematic areas, anti-discrimination and migration and asylum issues, as well as the development of citizenship skills and key competencies.

56. **Human Rights Education Associates** recommended continuing to enhance the focus of the second phase with a view to enabling the institutionalization of human rights education for the second phase's targeted sectors. Work during the third phase should promote sustainable strategies for human rights education as well as the training of trainers within different sectors.

57. **Human Rights Education USA**, a newly-formed human rights education network in the United States of America, suggested that the principal target group for the third phase be the general public, including both the formal and non-formal education sectors, with a focus on teachers and community education. It also recommended addressing the following groups: youth groups and their adult allies; senior citizens' groups; indigenous peoples; migrant workers, immigrants and refugees; workers in general; faith-based groups; and social media users. Thematically, Human Rights Education USA considered as priorities the right to personal security and safety, and the right to health; it mentioned a number of related issues, including school safety and a secure learning environment; environmental rights; violence against women, including domestic violence; weapons ownership rights and responsibilities; and labour rights.

58. The **Institute of Human Rights of the National Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan** proposed a focus on youth. The Institute also provided suggestions regarding the role and place of human rights education in Azerbaijan.

59. The **Netherlands Platform on Human Rights education** considered it difficult to contribute to the third phase of the World Programme from a Netherlands perspective, pointing to the lack of comprehensive action by the national authorities in the context of the first two phases.

60. **New Humanity** proposed, in terms of thematic areas, the issue of solidarity, with particular attention to "human duties" as a personal and collective responsibility vis-à-vis human rights, as well as human rights education in emergencies, with particular attention to related vulnerable groups such as refugees and displaced persons, women, children and persons with disabilities.

61. **Soka Gakkai International** suggested concentrating on human rights education with young adults and youth movements, which are both providers and beneficiaries of human rights education. In addition, it underlined that the third phase should encompass linkages with the preceding phases, as related work needs to continue. With regard to thematic areas, it suggested human rights education to prevent and eliminate racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance; momentum will be provided by two forthcoming anniversaries, i.e. the fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination in 2015 and the fifteenth anniversary of the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance in 2016.

62. The **U.S. Fund for UNICEF** suggested that the third phase should focus on the poorest and marginalized children and communities, especially girls, minorities and indigenous children, as well as persons with disabilities. Thematic issues should include maternal and neonatal health; access to quality education; gender equality; and HIV/AIDS. Target groups would include informal educators, community organizers, faith-based workers, health-care providers and the media.

## **B. Responses from other sources**

63. The Public Interest and Development Law Institute of **Wuhan University School of Law** (China) suggested a focus on legal empowerment, targeting grass-roots legal workers, paralegals, civil society organizations and community members. Thematic focus areas in this context could include human rights in general and international human rights mechanisms, the rights of persons with disabilities, labour rights and rights related to environmental protection.

64. Individual responses included a Columbia University professor who supported a focus on secondary school teachers, given their multiplier role, through appropriate pre-service and in-service training as well as ongoing support; and four individuals who highlighted the need to focus on languages issues in formal and informal education contexts, in particular with regard to migrants, refugees, indigenous and minorities groups, as well as human rights education in preschool and school education.

## **C. Report of the Global Human Rights Education Listserv consultation**

65. HREA and the NGO Working Group on Human Rights Education and Learning of the Conference of Non-Governmental Organization in Consultative Relationship with the United Nations presented a report, summarizing 41 contributions from 19 countries, of an online consultation which took place from 21 February to 21 March 2013 through the Global Human Rights Education Listserv, an electronic network of over 10,000 individuals and organizations interested in human rights education.

66. The report highlights the lack of systematic integration of human rights education in the formal education systems of various countries, as well as the opportunity provided by the World Programme for Human Rights Education, in particular for some national human rights institutions, to devote resources and strengthen research on national human rights education issues. Various contributors recommended during the third phase to continue targeting areas covered by the first and second phases with renewed efforts throughout the schooling sector, where human rights education and human rights training for teachers should be made mandatory, and with decision makers, lawmakers and government officials, and recommended that the use of informal tools such as social media be furthered.

67. The report stresses also a consensus among the contributors on the need for close cooperation among governmental and non-governmental actors and for cross-fertilization between formal and non-formal education methodologies and approaches. Non-formal human rights education efforts by civil society organizations include those aimed at community service organizations; faith-based groups; indigenous peoples; migrants and refugees; workers in general; youth groups and after-school clubs; and sports organizations. National authorities could further support those efforts, including by ensuring a safe and enabling environment for human rights education.

68. The contributors to the consultation highlighted a variety of priority topics for the third phase, including equality and non-discrimination; participation; conflict resolution; vulnerable groups; right to personal security and safety; right to health; human rights education and culture; human rights education and technology; human rights and business; gender issues; genocide education; and human rights in elections.

## **VI. Conclusions**

69. **The feedback received from States, national human rights institutions and other relevant stakeholders has demonstrated a diversity of approaches and priorities**

with regard to the target sectors, focus areas or thematic issues for the third phase of the World Programme, often reflecting national and regional contexts. The following paragraphs identify global patterns and general conclusions which can be drawn from the responses received.

70. A majority of the respondents – including 11 Governments, 12 national institutions, 2 intergovernmental and 6 civil society organizations – as well as the global consultation, emphasized the need to continue working with the target sectors that have been already identified in the previous phases, i.e. the formal education system – including primary, secondary and higher education and in particular the training of educators (teachers, professors and other education personnel) (19 respondents and the global consultation) – as well as training for civil servants (14 respondents), law enforcement officials (7 respondents) and the military (7 respondents).

71. These respondents highlighted gaps and a general lack of prioritization and action by relevant authorities, in particular with regard to developing policies as well as comprehensive and sustainable implementation strategies and action plans with dedicated resources, in the context of the World Programme for Human Rights Education as well as in light of the proclamation of the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training in December 2011. Hence, respondents highlighted the need to advance implementation where no significant action took place and to consolidate the work done, to undertake related research and map and share good practices and lessons learned, to sharpen education and training methodologies and approaches – including monitoring and evaluation systems – based on proven best practice, and to foster dialogue between duty bearers and civil society.

72. In this context, a target group which featured prominently in the responses as needing additional and focussed attention was the one constituted by educators, whether education professionals in the formal education system (19 respondents and the global consultation) – mainly at the primary and secondary education levels, with an emphasis on teacher-training institutions – or educators in non-formal settings (11 respondents and the global consultation), in particular those working with children and youth. Effective human rights training of teachers and educators was considered a key priority due to their outreach capacity and role in society.

73. Respondents who referred to other professional groups covered during the second phase of the World Programme for Human Rights Education – i.e. civil servants (including public sector policymakers, local authorities, social workers and health professionals), law enforcement officers (including police and prison agencies as well as security forces) and the military – argued that Governments need knowledgeable professionals able to develop policies and decisions in line with human rights principles, as well as to promote and protect human rights on behalf of the State.

74. A recurrent new target audience, indicated by 16 respondents (six Governments, six national institutions, one international organization and three civil society representatives) and the global consultation, included media professionals, journalists and social media users, considering their influence and potential impact on the general public, with a view to promote a higher level of journalistic quality as well more awareness of their social responsibility. Other influential groups indicated as future priority targets by a smaller number of respondents included parliamentarians, legislators and the judiciary.

75. Civil society organizations were identified as a future priority target sector by 12 respondents, with particular reference to human rights defenders, non-

governmental organizations, faith-based organizations and community-based organizations in light of the important role they play at the grass-roots level. Youth, as well as youth movements and organizations, were mentioned as priority target audience by 10 respondents and the global consultation; several respondents voiced the need to support non-formal education efforts reaching out to children and youth outside the formal education system.

76. A number of respondents, i.e. four Governments, two national institutions and three civil society organizations, considered that the third phase should be devoted to increasing human rights awareness among the general public, to empower people to stand up and protect their rights. Finally, three respondents drew attention to the need to address the early childhood sector, as research shows that children's experiences in their first years shape their identity and attitudes throughout life.

77. Fifteen respondents mentioned, as future priority target audiences, specific groups of rights holders including, in decreasing order, persons with disabilities (8); minorities and indigenous peoples (5); women victims of violence (4); migrants and migrant workers (3); people with limited access to their rights, in particular the poor (3); elderly persons (2); LGBT persons (2); refugees and asylum seekers (1); vulnerable people in emergencies (1); victims of human trafficking (1); and victims of armed conflict (1).

78. With respect to possible thematic areas, the responses were quite diverse, still reflecting national context and priorities. Recurrent themes included non-discrimination and equality, to facilitate integration and social inclusion (12 respondents and the global consultation), as well as the need to focus on developing knowledge and skills to promote active citizenship and participation (12 respondents and the global consultation), as a contribution to the strengthening of democracy, good governance and global citizenship. A focus on discrimination and violence against women and girls was highlighted by seven respondents; the rights of the child were pointed out by six respondents. Five respondents proposed economic, social and cultural rights, and another five suggested environmental rights. A focus on conflict prevention and resolution, with a view to build a culture of peace, was mentioned by some conflict-affected countries (four respondents and the global consultation). Other thematic areas proposed by more than one respondent were the promotion of safe learning environments to combat violence, bullying and harassment; labour rights; the rights of persons with disabilities and human rights and business.

---