



General Assembly

Distr.: General
29 June 2018

Original: English

Human Rights Council

Thirty-ninth session

10–28 September 2018

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 stakeholders on the target sectors, focus areas or thematic human rights issues for the fourth phase of the World Programme for Human Rights Education

Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

Summary

In the present report, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights summarizes the views of States, national human rights institutions, civil society organizations and other stakeholders on the target sectors, focus areas and thematic human rights issues for the fourth phase of the World Programme for Human Rights Education. In this regard, the report refers to contributions received until 29 May 2018 following a consultation launched on 16 March 2018 by the Office of the High Commissioner. It also includes information on a side event held during the thirty-seventh session of the Human Rights Council on the fourth phase of the World Programme.

The feedback received reflected the diversity of approaches and priorities of respondents, often based on specific national and regional contexts. Some global patterns and general conclusions are presented at the end of the report.

The majority of the respondents indicated youth as a priority sector for the fourth phase of the World Programme. Respondents also indicated groups and individuals in vulnerable situations, and the general public, as possible target sectors. Women, girls and children were referred to specifically as populations to be prioritized. Respondents also emphasized the importance of continuing the implementation of human rights education programmes in the sectors covered by the three previous phases.



With regard to possible thematic areas, a majority of respondents indicated a focus on equality, non-discrimination, inclusion and respect for diversity, with the aim of building inclusive and peaceful societies, and for aligning the fourth phase with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and specifically with target 4.7 of the Sustainable Development Goals. The role of culture in human rights education was specifically emphasized.

I. Introduction

1. In its resolution 36/12, the Human Rights Council requested the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) to seek the views of States, national human rights institutions, civil society organizations and other relevant stakeholders on the target sectors, focus areas or thematic human rights issues for the fourth phase of the World Programme for Human Rights Education, bearing in mind possible synergies with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and other relevant initiatives on human rights education and training, and to submit a report thereon to the Council at its thirty-ninth session. The present report was prepared pursuant to that request.

2. On 16 March 2018, OHCHR addressed a request to Member States, national human rights institutions and other stakeholders for their views and contributions. The consultation was also announced on the OHCHR website.

3. As at 29 May 2018, OHCHR had received 48 submissions (including three joint submissions) from 52 respondents: 13 Governments, 16 national human rights institutions, 20 civil society organizations and three individuals. The submissions may be consulted on the web page dedicated to the World Programme on the OHCHR website.

4. The Governments of Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Honduras, Italy, Mexico, the Russian Federation, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland and Thailand replied to the request sent by OHCHR.

5. The following national human rights institutions replied: the Office of the National Ombudsman (*Defensor del Pueblo de la Nación*) of Argentina, the Australian Human Rights Commission, the National Human Rights Institute (*Instituto Nacional de Derechos Humanos*) of Chile, the Office of the Ombudsman (*Defensoría del Pueblo de Colombia*) of Colombia, the Danish Institute for Human Rights, the Office of the Ombudsman (*Defensoría del Pueblo*) of Ecuador, the Office of the Human Rights Advocate (*Procuraduría para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos*) of El Salvador, the Finnish Human Rights Centre, the National Consultative Commission on Human Rights (*Commission nationale consultative des droits de l'homme*) of France, the Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain, the Office of the National Commissioner for Human Rights (*Comisionado Nacional de los Derechos Humanos*) of Honduras, the National Human Rights Commission of India, the Nigerian National Human Rights Commission, the Office of the Ombudsman of Portugal, the National Human Rights Commission of the Republic of Korea and the Office of the Ombudsman (*Defensor del Pueblo*) of Paraguay.¹

6. The following civil society organizations and networks replied: Amnesty International jointly with Human Rights Education Associates, the Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact, the Asian Legal Resource Centre jointly with the Asian Human Rights Commission, the National Association for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights (*Association nationale de promotion et de protection des droits de l'homme*) of Cameroon, Associazione 21 luglio Onlus, Centre africain de recherche industrielle, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, the European Youth Forum, Human Rights Educators USA, Human Rights Educators USA — D.C. Regional Representatives, Instituto de Desenvolvimento e Direitos Humanos, the Peruvian Institute of Education in Human Rights and Peace (*Instituto Peruano de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz*), the International Federation of Social Workers, the International Planned Parenthood Federation jointly with the Center for Reproductive Rights and the Swedish Association for Sexuality Education, Maytree and Soka Gakkai International. Three individuals also submitted their views.

7. Additionally, on 6 March 2018, at the thirty-seventh session of the Human Rights Council, the Working Group on Human Rights Education and Learning of the Conference of NGOs in Consultative Relationship with the United Nations organized the side event on

¹ Accreditation by the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions suspended in October 2014.

the theme “World Programme for Human Rights Education: what focus for the fourth phase?”. The event was co-sponsored by the States Platform on Human Rights Education and Training in the Human Rights Council (Brazil, Costa Rica, Italy, Morocco, Philippines, Senegal, Slovenia and Thailand) and the Liaison Office of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in Geneva. A brief summary of the discussions as reflected in the report on the side event is included below.

8. The first phase (2005–2009) of the World Programme for Human Rights Education was dedicated to the integration of human rights education into the primary and secondary school systems (see A/59/525/Rev.1). The second phase (2010–2014) focused on human rights education in higher education and human rights training for teachers and educators, civil servants, law enforcement officials and military personnel (see A/HRC/15/28). The third phase (2015–2019) has focused on strengthening the implementation of the first two phases and promoting human rights training for media professionals and journalists (see A/HRC/27/28).

9. In the present report, OHCHR summarizes all the submissions received and presents some general conclusions on the basis of the information contained in them. As requested by the Human Rights Council, it focuses on the target sectors, focus areas or thematic human rights issues proposed for the fourth phase. Information on specific human rights education programmes or other issues raised by respondents has not been included.

II. Responses from Governments

10. Pursuant to its national priorities, the Government of the Plurinational State of Bolivia proposed, as focus areas for the fourth phase of the World Programme, the development of socio-communitarian values and strategies to combat violence and to foster peaceful coexistence in the education systems, in accordance with human rights and fundamental freedoms; the development of strategies to foster responsible participation through democratic processes; and the eradication of spiritual poverty, in line with the Sustainable Development Goals.

11. The Government of Chile suggested that the thematic focus for the fourth phase should be education for the prevention of mass atrocities. As a member of the Latin American Network for Genocide and Mass Atrocity Prevention, Chile supported the thematic proposal of the network, as approved during its meetings, held in Quito in November 2016 and in New York in October 2017. In a document annexed to the submission, the fundamental role that education played in the prevention of mass atrocities and the creation of a culture of peace and human rights was highlighted; education systems should reflect ethnic, cultural and national diversity in society and promote social inclusion, respect for human rights and democratic citizenship among new generations. It also stated that education programmes should be accompanied by complementary public policies that respond to local contexts and needs.

12. The Government of Costa Rica also proposed a focus on human rights education as a means to prevent mass atrocities. It stated that education played a preventive role by creating more peaceful societies and fostering respect for human dignity.

13. The Government of Cuba suggested that the right to development should be the thematic focus for the fourth phase, and that political decision makers, parliamentarians and civil society should be the main target sectors. The right to development was indispensable for the enjoyment of all human rights and the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals; full acceptance of the right to development by main actors at the global level would contribute to the universalization of human rights.

14. The Government of Cyprus proposed a focus on human trafficking and on refugees, asylum seekers and migrants, given that these groups faced serious challenges to their enjoyment of human rights. They should therefore be the main target sectors of the fourth phase, together with the general public, employers, health professionals and public servants.

15. The Government of Honduras stressed the importance of strengthening the previous phases of the World Programme, and that a focus on the prevention of genocide, mass

atrocities and discrimination be included. It proposed that the target sectors should be urban and interurban transport drivers, people displaced by violence, users of State services in the area of economic, social and cultural rights, institutional human rights promoters and the military police. It encouraged measures for the accreditation and certification of educational offers in formal and non-formal education settings, and the implementation of monitoring and evaluation processes with regard to the impact of human rights education.

16. The Government of Italy proposed areas, topics and beneficiaries of educational interventions relating to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, in accordance with Sustainable Development Goal target 4.7² and consistent with national strategies. It stressed the importance of realizing the right to quality education and preventing juvenile distress; combating inequalities, particularly gender violence and discrimination against women; promoting global solidarity and sustainable development; and preserving cultural and natural heritage. A “culture of sustainability” should be disseminated at all levels of society and at all stages of formal and informal education, in accordance with the principle of lifelong learning. Specific target sectors highlighted by Italy included youth, children, unemployed young people, women, teachers and students, the most disadvantaged and marginalized social groups, and those most subject to discrimination.

17. The Government of Mexico proposed focusing on education for the prevention of mass atrocities. A culture of respect for human rights, to be achieved through education in the political, social and international spheres, could prevent conflicts and mass atrocities, given that often their root causes were human rights violations.

18. The Government of the Russian Federation emphasized the need to strengthen the implementation of the previous phases of the World Programme, and in particular to train mass-media specialists and journalists. It proposed a focus on human rights training for civil servants, in accordance with national priorities and ongoing activities. It also highlighted the importance of legal education for all citizens and human rights education at all levels of the education system and for students of all ages.

19. The Government of Slovakia recommended strengthening, through the World Programme, global programmes that contributed to achieving target 4.7 of the Sustainable Development Goals. In this regard, it referred to the UNESCO-led initiatives on the themes “Education for global citizenship”, “Prevention of violent extremism through education” and “Education for sustainable development”. Education for global citizenship was, in particular, an educational dimension of all subjects that developed awareness, understanding and critical thinking about various issues of global concern, such as poverty and hunger, globalization, migration, conflicts, and the environment.

20. According to the Government of Sweden, quality education for all, and specifically human rights education, were prerequisites for broad, inclusive and sustainable development. Education also played a decisive role in normalization and reconstruction in conflict and post-conflict settings. Sweden proposed, as the thematic focus, women’s and girls’ enjoyment of human rights, in particular with regard to sexual and reproductive health and rights, and comprehensive sexuality education. The target groups should be women and men, girls and boys in primary and secondary school systems in conflict and post-conflict settings, and health-care personnel, educators and humanitarian actors. It stressed that sexual and reproductive health and rights were prerequisites for gender equality, the empowerment of girls and women, and their enjoyment of all human rights.

21. The Government of Switzerland stated that education, which helped to build peaceful and sustainable societies, was essential in a globalized world with unresolved social, political, economic and environmental challenges. Human rights education was an important component of global citizenship education that empowered people to participate

² Target 4.7 of the Sustainable Development Goals calls upon States to ensure that, by 2030, all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, the promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and an appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture’s contribution to sustainable development.

in local and global choices and to act in a responsible way. Switzerland suggested that the fourth phase should be linked to the Incheon Declaration and its framework for action for the implementation of target 4.7 of the Sustainable Development Goals, with a focus on global citizenship education. As main target sectors, it proposed the general public, decision makers in economy and politics, and leaders of educational institutions.

22. The Government of Thailand saw the World Programme as an inspiring and helpful action guide for States and other stakeholders aiming to increase awareness and understanding of human rights. It suggested that the fourth phase focus on synergies and mutually reinforcing linkages between human rights and the Sustainable Development Goals, and in particular target 4.7. It proposed that the target sectors be members of parliament and politicians, business professionals, health-care personnel and, in view of their contribution to human rights protection, science, technology, engineering and mathematics students and professionals. It also encouraged all stakeholders to continue to strengthen their efforts to implement the previous phases of the World Programme, and highlighted the importance of effective coordination between OHCHR, UNESCO and United Nations country teams to ensure coherence and effectiveness in the implementation of the World Programme.

III. Responses from national human rights institutions

23. The Office of the National Ombudsman (*Defensor del Pueblo de la Nación*) of Argentina stressed that the fourth phase should focus on strengthening implementation of the previous phases and of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. In accordance with national priorities, the fourth phase could target education personnel, members of professional associations, trade unions, the business community and social organizations, and also health professionals and staff members of health-care institutions.

24. The Australian Human Rights Commission recommended a focus on modern slavery, given its global scale and prevalence. For the target sectors, it suggested the general public, private businesses, and employers and workers' organizations, particularly in those sectors where forced labour was most common, such as in agriculture, construction, manufacturing, domestic service and the commercial sex industry.

25. The National Human Rights Institute (*Instituto Nacional de Derechos Humanos*) of Chile proposed that the fourth phase focus on strengthening methodological guidance to support the integration of the principles of equality and non-discrimination in compulsory formal education and higher education, and in the training of public officials and those responsible for educational processes in the above sectors. Such a focus would contribute to the universalization of human rights and help to reduce the vulnerability of marginalized groups, particularly in the light of the growing intolerance towards migrants and displaced persons. The implementation of the previous phases of the World Programme had not yet been completed; during the fourth phase, the development of legally binding instruments in the area of human rights education and training might therefore be regarded as a way to strengthen existing commitments.

26. The Office of the Ombudsman (*Defensoría del Pueblo*) of Colombia suggested that the fourth phase focus on the thematic issues of development, globalization and citizen participation; equality, inclusion and non-discrimination; and security and coexistence. In educational processes, special emphasis should be given to the right to peace, the rights of victims, and also to collective, environmental and cultural rights. It proposed, as target sectors, preschool, basic and primary education personnel, designers and creators of virtual media and social networks, public officials, and victims of internal and international armed conflicts.

27. According to the Danish Institute for Human Rights, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the prevention of violent extremism and the limited implementation of the previous phases of the World Programme should be taken into consideration when deciding on the thematic focus of the fourth phase. It highlighted the importance of securing a stronger commitment to human rights education by Governments and educational institutions. To this end, it proposed that the plan of action for the fourth

phase envisage the formulation of a national plan of action or strategy for human rights education and the appointment of a national human rights education focal point to coordinate the development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of human rights education at the national level. The plan of action for the fourth phase should also include standard learning objectives for specific audiences, particularly in the context of formal education. Lastly, the Institute stressed that the quality and extent of the implementation of human rights education should also be reported by States and monitored through United Nations human rights mechanisms (such as the treaty bodies and the special procedures of the Human Rights Council, and in the context of the universal periodic review), and also with regard to target 4.7 of the Sustainable Development Goals.

28. The Office of the Ombudsman (*Defensoría del Pueblo*) of Ecuador praised the World Programme as useful guidance for Governments and stakeholders in building respect for human rights and peaceful societies. For the fourth phase, it suggested strengthening the implementation and evaluation of and follow-up to previous phases by, for example, further integrating human rights into education curricula and plans at all levels of formal education, developing strategies to reach those outside the formal education system through non-formal and informal education, and promoting public information to increase civic participation in institutional processes. As a possible thematic focus, it proposed sexual and reproductive rights, centred on girls' and women's access to relevant information and health care, and the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons and communities. As a second thematic focus, it proposed collective and environmental rights, particularly targeting populations and organizations directly affected by development and natural resources extraction projects, advocates, and relevant authorities and public officials.

29. The Office of the Human Rights Advocate (*Procuraduría para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos*) of El Salvador referred to various thematic areas for different target sectors, including general human rights education, with a focus on a culture of peace and non-violence targeting the general public, public institutions, educational communities and the media; the right to quality education for educational communities and national human rights institutions; and the right to a healthy environment targeting businesses and the general public. Other thematic issues included equality and non-discrimination, with a focus on groups and individuals in vulnerable situations and targeting the general public, relevant State institutions and the media, and truth, justice and reparation targeting victims of human rights violations, judges, prosecutors, legal professionals, politicians, parliamentarians and civil society. Lastly, it stressed that, during the fourth phase, the capacity of national human rights institutions should be strengthened in the area of human rights education through the establishment of networks allowing the exchange of experiences and academic research.

30. The Finnish Human Rights Centre recommended that the fourth phase highlight the positive outcomes for societies resulting from respecting and protecting human rights, such as equal opportunities, non-discrimination, participation, social cohesion and security. With regard to target sectors, it suggested politicians and other political actors at all levels (local, regional, national and international), given their decision-making role and their responsibility in shaping the attitudes of their constituencies towards human rights. Continuing efforts to implement the previous phases of the World Programme was also important.

31. The National Consultative Commission on Human Rights (*Commission nationale consultative des droits de l'homme*) of France recommended that the fourth phase contribute to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and in particular Sustainable Development Goal 4 on quality education, and build on the good practices and lessons learned during the previous phases. With regard to target sectors, it proposed youth, given the role of young people in the realization of human rights, and recommended that they be involved in the design and implementation of related educational activities. Focus should also be centred on intercultural education, particularly of migrant and minority children, and on fighting discrimination against girls, in particular with regard to their access to education. Parliamentarians and the private sector were also mentioned as possible target sectors.

32. The Equality and Human Rights Commission of Great Britain suggested a focus on the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons, and that the general public be targeted.

33. The Office of the National Commissioner for Human Rights (*Comisionado Nacional de los Derechos Humanos*) of Honduras proposed a large number of possible target sectors, including trade unions, cooperatives, professional associations, private companies, artists, networks of groups in vulnerable situations, municipalities, judicial authorities, legislative authorities, health professionals and parents. As thematic areas, it proposed human security (the right to education, sexual and reproductive rights, the right to work, the right to water, the right to a healthy environment and cultural rights), administration of justice (the right to life, the right to security, the right to personal integrity and freedom, the right to justice and the right to truth) and democracy (the right to freedom of expression, the right to have access to information and the right to participate in public affairs). It also highlighted the importance of targeting groups in vulnerable situations and other specific populations: in this regard, it listed children, migrants, sexual minorities, persons deprived of their liberty, older persons, indigenous and Afrodescendent peoples, women, young people, persons with disabilities, human rights defenders, journalists and justice officials.

34. The National Human Rights Commission of India suggested focusing on various thematic areas, including the right to the highest attainable standard of health; the right of socially excluded groups to be free from discrimination with regard to health care, and of groups in vulnerable situations to be a focus of health law and policy; the right of everyone to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its application; international human rights law; the rights of persons with disabilities; the rights of the child; and the rights to life and liberty. The Commission suggested that the target sectors be professionals working in the area of medicine (including medical students, regulatory bodies, medical education boards and health policymakers), scientists, engineers and lawyers, given that they were major stakeholders in the attainment of the Sustainable Development Goals.

35. The Nigerian National Human Rights Commission suggested two thematic areas: the right to education, targeting parents, teachers and students, parliamentarians, government educational authorities, national human rights institutions, and civil society organizations; and the administration of the justice system, focusing on access to justice (including legal awareness, legal aid and alternative dispute resolution) and the professionalization of justice personnel, and addressing the general public, but also the judiciary, parliamentarians, ministries and related departments, and law enforcement agencies.

36. The Office of the Ombudsman of Portugal proposed various target sectors, including the general public, employers, entrepreneurs, corporations and other business enterprises, officials, civil servants and employers of detention and accommodation facilities, and young people. The Ombudsman suggested a thematic focus for each target sector: for instance, human rights education for young people should focus on their right to health, the prevention of substance abuse and their role as future responsible citizens; education for the general public would be directed at fostering tolerance and respect of “the other”. In the case of employers, entrepreneurs, corporations and other business enterprises, the focus should be on fighting exploitation, reconciling work and family life, and promoting gender equality and the human rights of consumers. For officials, civil servants and employers of detention and accommodation facilities, education should develop their human rights knowledge and skills so as to prevent situations of inhuman and degrading treatment and to protect the rights of detainees, residents or users, and respect their autonomy and dignity.

37. According to the National Human Rights Commission of the Republic of Korea, human rights education was an important first step towards the realization of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It emphasized the importance of strengthening the implementation of the previous phases of the World Programme and of addressing hatred and discrimination against minorities and other human rights violations. The Commission presented a variety of thematic areas for the fourth phase, including the human rights of women, sexual minorities and migrants, gender equality, labour rights and human rights-based business management, and also human rights and the media, particularly online media. Human rights education was a process that should accompany individuals

throughout the different stages of their lives, with the focus depending on the specific stage. In the case of small children, it suggested that the focus could be the respect for the other; for young people, it would be important also to address labour rights. The Commission also referred to the need to develop monitoring and evaluation methodologies for human rights education, including relevant outcome indicators, to focus on the training of educators and to define further the scope of human rights education in target 4.7 of the Sustainable Development Goals.

38. The Office of the Ombudsman (*Defensor del Pueblo*) of Paraguay suggested that attention be focused on the penitentiary system, targeting both people deprived of their liberty and prison officials. It pointed to the need to strengthen the knowledge and skills of penitentiary staff so that they could effectively apply relevant international human rights standards. With regard to persons deprived of their liberty, it emphasized that human rights education should contribute to their social reintegration after their release.

IV. Responses from civil society

39. In their joint submission, Amnesty International and Human Rights Education Associates introduced their suggestions, accompanied by an analysis of current challenges to human rights, including the general rollback of human rights across regions, the clampdown on the rights to free speech and peaceful protest, the rapidly growing global refugee crisis and the shrinking space for human rights defenders and civil society. They also identified specific challenges to human rights education, including the lack of prioritization and resources, and inadequate evaluation and follow-up processes. In this context, the two organizations proposed that young people, the main target sector equipped with effective human rights education through formal and non-formal education, could be a major driving force in building human rights cultures around the world. They also proposed human rights defenders, for whom human rights education should provide a safe space to gain the knowledge and skills to protect human rights, and media professionals and journalists, in accordance with the focus of the third phase of the World Programme. The organizations also promoted the development of sustainable monitoring and evaluation frameworks to measure the impact and progress of human rights education, including in the context of target 4.7 of the Sustainable Development Goals; countering toxic narratives and discrimination, and supporting critical thinking and empathy; and integrating gender and diversity systematically into human rights education programming.

40. For the fourth phase of the World Programme, the Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact suggested that marginalized groups, in particular indigenous peoples, might be possible target sectors, with particular emphasis on girls and women, and persons with disabilities. It proposed a thematic focus on inclusive education, through multilingual or mother tongue-based education and context-specific and culturally sensitive education, to ensure opportunities for all in accordance with the objective of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development of “leaving no one behind”. The respondent explained that, while indigenous peoples made up 5 per cent of the world’s population, they represented 15 per cent of the world’s extreme poor. Poverty and discrimination, inter alia, had posed persistent challenges for indigenous peoples when benefiting from quality and accessible education that was culturally pertinent.

41. The Asian Legal Resources Centre and the Asian Human Rights Commission submitted a joint proposal for the fourth phase in which they suggested that lower court judges and the general public, including students in schools and colleges, were key target sectors. Human rights education for judges should cover due process and the rule of law, while programmes for the general public should highlight the illegality, inhumane character and ineffectiveness of torture and violence, to reduce the normalization of the use of torture within justice systems and to ensure the accountability of the State. Further efforts had to be made to educate people about the reformative and rehabilitative aspects of the justice system.

42. According to the National Association for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights (*Association nationale de promotion et de protection des droits de l’homme*) of

Cameroon, the fourth phase of the World Programme should build on the previous phases. It suggested various target sectors, including girls and women, refugees, law enforcement agencies and civil servants, education personnel, the general public and civil society organizations. Thematic areas could include social and economic rights, in particular the rights to privacy, to water and sanitation, to a healthy environment, to health, to education and to food, in addition to combating youth unemployment and fostering the right of youth to work. The Association also highlighted the right to justice and due process, good governance and the fight against corruption, and the protection of women, children, indigenous peoples, refugees and internally displaced persons, prisoners, minorities, migrant workers and persons with disabilities.

43. Associazione 21 luglio Onlus focused on the importance of fighting discrimination against minorities and groups in vulnerable situations, and particularly children, including groups living in emergency housing, slums and microsettlements. The organization highlighted the need for more inclusive education and social policies for these groups.

44. Centre africain de recherche industrielle suggested that the fourth phase should focus on educating government officials and policymakers, to increase respect of the rule of law and the fair management of public affairs, which would in turn lead to greater respect for human rights.

45. Christian Solidarity Worldwide recommended that the right to freedom of religion or belief be the thematic focus of the fourth phase. It highlighted the need for related training particularly in schools, especially with regard to religious minorities, to tackle discrimination on the basis of religion or belief in educational settings.

46. The European Youth Forum proposed that the fourth phase target youth organizations, given that they could mobilize young people to contribute to building a more peaceful, just, inclusive and equitable society. The fourth phase should focus on the role of youth organizations and movements in conflict prevention and peacebuilding processes, in accordance with target 4.7 of the Sustainable Development Goals; young people were active both during conflicts, because of their access to local communities, and in post-conflict settings, in peace and reconciliation processes. Youth organizations were in contact with young people that were socially excluded (out-of-school, unemployed or victims of various types of discriminatory acts) and contributed to human rights education in informal environments. The Forum highlighted the importance of supporting and empowering them to continue to engage young people, particularly in partnership with formal education institutions.

47. Human Rights Educators USA suggested that education decision makers and gatekeepers, including professional associations involved in establishing university-based degrees and criteria for licensed professions (such as education and social work), should be the target sectors for the fourth phase. The fourth phase should effectively engage influential actors with education responsibilities and authority, and also acknowledge and empower civil society entities working to promote the World Programme and the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training. It would therefore be an opportunity to highlight and disseminate information about local-level decisions that fostered human rights education and local human rights education initiatives, raising their visibility and legitimacy as part of global programmes.

48. According to the D.C. Regional Representatives of Human Rights Educators USA, the thematic issues of the fourth phase should be the right to science and the enjoyment of the benefits of science, the right to a healthy environment and the rights to information, participation and justice. For the target sectors, it proposed attorneys and legal professionals, science, technology, engineering and mathematics professionals and educators, and faith communities, owing to their specific impact on the realization of human rights.

49. Instituto de Desenvolvimento e Direitos Humanos recommended that the target sectors of the fourth phase be young people and health professionals. Addressing young people was important, because youth was a crucial period of personal development when the individual develops values and beliefs and begins to experience what citizenship entails. In its submission, it also focused on health professionals, since they worked closely with rights holders and victims of human rights abuses, such as domestic violence.

50. The Peruvian Institute of Education in Human Rights and Peace (*Instituto Peruano de Educación en Derechos Humanos y la Paz*) proposed focusing on the development of a form of intercultural citizenship, based on human rights and gender equality, as a means to fight discrimination and racism, insecurity, violence and political corruption. These problems had a negative effect on democratic life, especially for young people, who eventually lose interest in engaging and participating in public and political affairs.

51. The International Federation of Social Workers recommended that social workers be the target sector of the fourth phase, to enable them to work more strategically for human rights. Social work was practised worldwide, promoting human rights and working towards the realization of the Sustainable Development Goals at the community, national and international levels.

52. The International Planned Parenthood Federation, the Center for Reproductive Rights and the Swedish Association for Sexuality Education presented a joint submission in which they expressed their support for comprehensive sexuality education, including on human sexuality, sexual and reproductive health, human rights and gender equality, as a key component of human rights education and a focus area for the fourth phase. United Nations entities, including UNESCO and the World Health Organization, and other organizations had already addressed the importance of sex education in schools and of the specific needs of young people in the belief that such education should commence at an early age. Adolescents and girls, school teachers, and social, religious and traditional leaders were possible target sectors.

53. Maytree proposed the thematic focus of building a culture of rights, with emphasis on the social contract (the roles of rights holders and duty bearers), targeting the general public. It highlighted the importance for all individuals to understand how and why human rights mattered in their daily lives.

54. Soka Gakkai International emphasized that, according to data provided by the United Nations, there were some 1.8 billion young people in the world today, the largest youth population ever, and that more than a third of the 169 targets of the Sustainable Development Goals highlighted the role of young people and the importance of their empowerment, participation and well-being; young people should therefore be a target sector for the fourth phase. Human rights education for them should take place also through non-formal education, with the aim of reaching young learners in geographically remote areas, students with disabilities, groups in vulnerable situations, and persons living in extreme poverty. Soka Gakkai International also referred to the progress made during the previous phases of the World Programme and to the limited information available, and stressed the importance of States submitting their national progress reports on a regular basis.

55. Individual responses included a university professor, who recommended that the fourth phase should focus on human rights education for primary and secondary school teachers and within teacher-training institutions; a school teacher who highlighted the importance of quality education for persons with special educational needs; and a university student, who underscored the role of human rights education in democratic processes, particularly in fostering the engagement of students.

V. Human Rights Council side event

56. On 6 March 2018, at the thirty-seventh session of the Human Rights Council, the Working Group on Human Rights Education and Learning of the Conference of NGOs in Consultative Relationship with the United Nations held a side event on the theme “World Programme for Human Rights Education: what focus for the fourth phase?”. The event was co-sponsored by the States Platform on Human Rights Education and Training in the Human Rights Council (Brazil, Costa Rica, Italy, Morocco, Philippines, Senegal, Slovenia and Thailand) and the UNESCO Liaison Office in Geneva. More than 75 representatives of States, international organizations, academia and civil society organizations participated in the event.

57. According to the States Platform, the implementation of human rights education and training was crucial for the full realization of all human rights and played a key role in building inclusive societies, strengthening social cohesion and achieving a sustainable future. Participants emphasized the importance of building on good practices and lessons learned during the previous phases of the World Programme, and of placing its fourth phase in the context of other current relevant initiatives, such as the UNESCO-led initiatives on global citizenship education and target 4.7 of the Sustainable Development Goals.

58. Several participants discussed the importance of empowering youth, particularly girls, to become active citizens, to be able to tackle global challenges and contribute to building inclusive, just, peaceful and resilient societies. They emphasized that young people were critical agents of change and had a crucial role to play in peacebuilding. Other participants suggested that the general public, health professionals, the private sector and businesses were possible target sectors. In the discussion, participants also focused on cultural rights and the need to root human rights education within local cultural contexts.

VI. Conclusions

59. The views submitted by States, national human rights institutions and other stakeholders on the target sectors, focus areas or thematic human rights issues for the fourth phase of the World Programme reflected a diversity of approaches and priorities often determined by specific local, national and regional contexts.

60. Several respondents stressed that, during the fourth phase, all stakeholders should continue to implement human rights education programmes in the sectors covered by the three previous phases of the World Programme, namely, the formal education system (primary, secondary, higher education and vocational training), civil servants, law enforcement officials and the military, and media professionals and journalists. In their submissions, respondents often proposed these as target sectors for the fourth phase. Respondents also highlighted the importance during the fourth phase of building on documented good practices and lessons learned from the previous phases; to that end, the exchange of experiences should be facilitated.

61. Another overall consideration shared by many respondents was the importance of ensuring that the fourth phase of the World Programme was aligned with and contributed to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in general, and to the achievement of target 4.7 of the Sustainable Development Goals in particular. With regard to that target, some respondents highlighted the strategic importance of cooperation and coordination between OHCHR, UNESCO and United Nations country teams.

62. The majority of respondents indicated youth as a priority for the fourth phase, for a variety of reasons. For example, one respondent pointed out that addressing young people was important because youth was a crucial period of personal development, when the individual develops values and beliefs and begins to experience what citizenship entails. Another respondent highlighted the fact that, according to United Nations data, there were some 1.8 billion young people in the world today, the largest youth population ever, and that more than a third of the 169 targets of the Sustainable Development Goals drew attention to the role of young people and the importance of their empowerment, participation and well-being. Various respondents highlighted the role played by young people as agents of change and a driving force for human rights, and their capacity to mobilize their peers, including those belonging to marginalized and other groups and individuals in vulnerable situations.

63. The emphasis that respondents placed on engaging with groups and individuals in vulnerable situations — migrants, refugees and displaced persons, indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities, religious minorities, persons deprived of their liberty, sexual minorities, the extreme poor, persons living in emergency housing, slums or microsettlements or in geographically remote areas, and out-of-school children — in accordance with the objective of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development of “leaving no one behind” was noteworthy. Respondents explained that

engaging with such groups through human rights education would reduce their vulnerability, facilitate their participation in the formulation of laws and policies that concerned them, foster equality and help to fight against discrimination and xenophobia.

64. Women, girls and children were referred to specifically as an important population to be prioritized in outreach efforts, in all of the above-mentioned sectors.

65. Other target sectors suggested by a number of respondents included the general public, and professional and other groups whose work had a direct impact on human rights, such as parliamentarians and politicians, legal professionals, lawyers and judges, health professionals, the private sector and businesses, civil society organizations, human rights defenders, science, technology, engineering and mathematics professionals, and social workers.

66. With regard to thematic areas, the responses were quite diverse, largely reflecting specific national contexts and priorities. Some of the overarching thematic areas prevalent in many submissions were promoting education aimed at building inclusive and peaceful societies with a focus on equality, non-discrimination, inclusion and respect for diversity, and aligning the fourth phase with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and specifically with target 4.7 of the Sustainable Development Goals. Various submissions contained an emphasis on the importance of education in fighting intolerance and discrimination, which were increasing in parallel to growing migration and refugee movements around the world. Some submissions also pointed to the contribution made by human rights education to global citizenship education and a culture of peace in formal, non-formal and informal settings at all levels, thereby helping to prevent conflict and human rights violations and mass atrocities. Reference was frequently made to the important role played by culture, from various perspectives, within this framework and in human rights education overall.

67. Some submissions highlighted the importance of developing further human rights education methodology, and in particular tools and indicators to monitor and measure the progress and impact of human rights education. Other recurrent thematic areas included specific rights or groups of rights, such as the right to health, access to justice, sexual and reproductive health and rights and comprehensive sexuality education, environmental rights, the right to education, the right to a healthy environment and the right to development.
