



General Assembly

Distr.: General
26 December 2011

Original: English

Human Rights Council

Nineteenth session

Agenda item 5

Human rights bodies and mechanisms

Report of the 2011 Social Forum (Geneva, 3-5 October 2011)

Chairperson-Rapporteur: Mr. Minelik Alemu Getahun (Ethiopia)

Summary

The present report contains a summary of discussions and recommendations of the 2011 Social Forum, which was held in Geneva from 3 to 5 October 2011, in accordance with Human Rights Council resolution 16/26.

The 2011 Social Forum focused on the right to development and heard expert presentations, each complemented by interactive exchange of views, leading to recommendations in relation to the promotion and effective realization of the right to development, including the role and contribution of civil society and international assistance and cooperation.

Contents

| | <i>Paragraphs</i> | <i>Page</i> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| I. Introduction | 1–3 | 3 |
| II. Organization of the Social Forum | 4–9 | 3 |
| III. Summary of proceedings | 10–54 | 4 |
| A. The promotion and effective realization of the right to development, in the context of the commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Right to Development | 10–20 | 4 |
| B. Measures and actions needed to make the right to development a reality for everyone at the local, national, regional and international levels, including the role and contribution of civil society and non-governmental organizations..... | 21–38 | 8 |
| C. International assistance and cooperation, as well as the promotion of an enabling environment for the realization of the right to development ... | 39–54 | 13 |
| IV. Conclusions and recommendations | 55–68 | 17 |
| A. Conclusions | 55–60 | 17 |
| B. Recommendations..... | 61–68 | 18 |
| Annexes | | |
| I. Provisional agenda | | 20 |
| II. List of participants..... | | 21 |

I. Introduction

1. The Human Rights Council, in its resolution 6/13, decided to preserve the Social Forum as a vital space for dialogue between the representatives of Member States, civil society, including grass-roots organizations and intergovernmental organizations on issues linked with the promotion of the enjoyment of all human rights by all. Consequently, the Social Forum met annually since 2008.¹

2. In accordance with resolution 16/26 of the Council, the 2011 Social Forum was held in Geneva from 3 to 5 October 2011. In September 2011, the President of the Council appointed Minelik Alemu Getahun, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary and Permanent Representative of Ethiopia to the United Nations Office at Geneva, as the Chairperson-Rapporteur of the 2011 Social Forum.

3. The present report contains a summary of discussions held at the 2011 Social Forum, as well as its conclusions and recommendations.

II. Organization of the Social Forum

4. The Chairperson-Rapporteur, in his opening remarks, highlighted that in the 25 years since the adoption of the Declaration on the Right to Development, the understanding of the right to development has evolved and matured, with due credit to be given to the mandate of the Working Group on the Right to Development and the high-level task force on the implementation of the right to development. He stressed that the right to development would help bridge the gaps in current realities and how to mould responses and actions. That would entail highlighting genuine implementation of human rights at the ground level, making the aid environment more effective, seeking a fairer and equitable trade regime, ensuring that development was environmentally sustainable, keeping to the forefront of one's mind that people were the touchstone that drove the entire process.²

5. On behalf of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), Marcia V.J. Kran, Director of the Research and Right to Development Division, delivered welcoming remarks. She referred to the numerous commemorative activities undertaken thus far during the anniversary year and the wealth of information contained in the background report submitted by the High Commissioner to the Social Forum (A/HRC/SF/2011/2). She particularly highlighted the role of civil society in the promotion and protection of the right to development and stressed that their engagement was essential to identify challenges and obstacles but also solutions to current problems.

6. The President of the Human Rights Council, Laura Dupuy Lasserre (Uruguay), in her remarks, recalled that she had chaired the previous year's Social Forum and emphasized that the Social Forum was an ideal space for interactive dialogue between Member States, civil society and international organizations. She underlined the multiple dimensions of development and highlighted in particular sustainability. Development was a means of achieving well-being of populations, social inclusion and justice. Development went hand in hand with the promotion of a democratic society and human rights. Despite the progress

¹ For further details on the Social Forum, see www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Poverty/SForum/Pages/SForumIndex.aspx.

² The full version of the statements and presentations made available to the Secretariat are posted on the OHCHR website at www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Poverty/SForum/Pages/StatementsPresentations.aspx.

made and the efforts undertaken, numerous obstacles and challenges required ambitious international commitment to meet the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015.

7. As requested by the Council, in its resolution 16/26, the 2011 Social Forum focused its discussion on: (a) the promotion and effective realization of the right to development, in the context of the commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Right to Development; (b) measures and actions needed to make the right to development a reality for everyone at the local, national, regional and international levels, including the role and contribution of civil society and non-governmental organizations; and (c) international assistance and cooperation, as well as the promotion of an enabling environment for the realization of the right to development.

8. Accordingly, the programme of work³ was prepared under the guidance of the Chairperson-Rapporteur, taking into account the input received from Member States and other relevant stakeholders. The 2011 Social Forum held an interactive debate involving 29 expert presentations on seven different thematic panels on issues relating to the theme under focus and featured presentation of audio-visual materials commissioned for the Social Forum.

9. In addition to the provisional agenda (A/HRC/SF/2011/1; see annex I) and the programme of work mentioned above, the 2011 Social Forum had before it the background report (A/HRC/SF/2011/2) submitted by OHCHR pursuant to paragraph 8 of Council resolution 16/26.

III. Summary of proceedings

A. The promotion and effective realization of the right to development, in the context of the commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Right to Development

1. Development challenges and futures

10. Kumi Naidoo, Director, Greenpeace International, speaking on climate justice and the right to development, pointed out that the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Right to Development should be a time for substantial engagement, and noting progress made and making clear what main challenges had to be addressed and how. However, there was little reason to celebrate, given the many crises and unresolved problems in the world, including those affecting the majority of people for which the current conversation was about – the most vulnerable, the most marginalized and the most powerless. He particularly pointed to the non-delivery of the peace dividend after the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the recognition of the planet as a finite resource, the increase in number of elections held not accompanied by an increase in the volume and quality of democracy and the shrinking democratic space for civil society after the 9/11 attacks. In his view, the multiple crises faced were interconnected and could only be addressed in an intersectional manner, and not by treating those crises as separate issues. He pointed out that climate change was a peace and security, development, jobs, energy and, of course, environmental issue. There was a need for a development vision rooted in the transition to a new green economy. As concerned the post-2015 MDG framework, particular attention had to be placed on integration of benchmarks to what are presently MDGs 7 and 8, to achieve MDG accountability and the political commitment to meet the goals. It was further essential that

³ Available from www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/SForum/pow_SocialForum2011.pdf.

civil society organizations' role at the micro, meso and macro levels were recognized as legitimate and necessary. He concluded by making an appeal to Governments to recognize that civil society should be embraced as a key player in changing governance and policy, as well as delivery, because if Governments only embraced civil society's delivery role then it was akin to saying that they only viewed civil society as cheap labour and not as full partners comprehensively addressing development.

11. Antonio Tujan, co-chair, BetterAid, speaking on the right to development as a tool for promoting the struggle for human dignity and development, expressed concern that the current climate of crisis and depression was hindering or reversing progress made towards sustainable development. It had thus become even more urgent to consciously promote and monitor the right to development as a beacon for all who aspired to the well-being and development of humanity. As a human right, it placed emphasis on the dimension on enablement and empowerment, participation and accountability. It was, inter alia, the role of civil society to push for accountability, and civil society groups had consistently used human rights frameworks and the right to development in monitoring aid and development cooperation. Referring to the Third High Level Forum for Aid Effectiveness held in Accra in 2008, he pointed to some positive developments, such as the recognition of internationally agreed development goals and the recognition of civil society organizations as independent development actors in their own right. Their participation at all levels of development, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation was essential. Civil society groups had campaigned for rights-based development effectiveness to be included in the discussions at the Fourth High Level Forum in Busan, which was to be held on 30 November–1 December 2011. Human rights had to be at the heart of any new development cooperation architecture and complement the role of the Development Cooperation Forum. He mentioned a proposal for a convention on development effectiveness, to be under the aegis of the United Nations system, and the need to explore how aid can have a catalytic role for right to development and development effectiveness.

12. Karin Arts, Professor, Institute of Social Studies, addressing the role of international law in the realization of the right to development, pointed out that the record of international law with respect to the right to development was mixed. Beyond the Declaration itself, several international legal instruments had played a major part in bringing development issues in the realm of binding obligations. She encouraged the use of existing legally binding norms for promoting the right to development, such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child. She also underlined that the right to development, although primarily being seen as targeting underdevelopment and the role of international cooperation, was a right that belonged to every human person and applied to all countries, both in the North and the South, in particular with the rise of poverty in the North and the emergence of new powers in the global economy. Positions and roles were changing, and that might help to create new dynamics, spaces and opportunities for action in pursuit of the right to development. She concluded with a plea to recognize existing binding international law relevant to the right to development, and mobilizing it by invoking it more systematically and vocally.

13. In ensuing interactive debate, Pakistan, North-South XXI, China, the Global Network for the Right to Development, Qatar, Maldives, Housing and Land Rights Network, Sri Lanka, Morocco, Indonesia, Civicus and Nepal made interventions. It was reaffirmed that there was a need to operationalize the right to development as a matter of priority. Concern was expressed at the impact of climate change, particularly in worsening the situation of vulnerable groups. Emphasis was put on the need for technology transfer, the reform of the international economic and financial architecture and policy coherence, but also the implementation of the Istanbul Declaration and Programme of Action on Least Developed countries (LDCs). Concern was further expressed that, despite the call from non-governmental organizations (NGOs) for the establishment of a Human Rights Council

special procedure on climate change and human rights, no such mandate had been created yet and the request was reiterated. At the same time, the creation of a new mandate on a democratic and equitable international order was welcome. The importance of international cooperation was underlined, with a need for clear sharing of responsibilities between national and international actors, and including South-South and triangular cooperation. Concern was expressed that the notion of development was abused in order to violate human rights, for example, by evicting people to achieve MDG 7 aiming at the reduction of slums in cities. There was a need to challenge the predominance of neoliberal economic policies. The debate also highlighted the challenges of the shrinking space for civil society.

14. In concluding remarks, the panellists responded to specific questions raised and comments made. Ms. Arts, concerning the question of whether or not the right to development belonged to customary international law, expressed the view that indeed some elements were part of customary law. In her view the added value of the right to development was the focus on comprehensive and coherent policy responses at the national and international level. Mr. Tujan reiterated the catalytic role of civil society in integrating the human rights framework into the development effectiveness agenda and ensuring accountability. Mr. Naidoo, on the issue of climate negotiations, emphasized the need for a fair, ambitious and legally binding instrument. As concerned the issue of climate justice, he pointed out that it should not be viewed as divisive but instead as providing an opportunity to take an honest look at the issue, who carries historical responsibility with a view to securing the future and moving from national focused agendas to global responses that looked beyond injustices of history.

2. The Declaration on the Right to Development at 25

15. Craig Mokhiber, Chief, Development and Economic and Social Issues Branch, OHCHR, emphasized that the right to development was a human right on par and interdependent with all other human rights. The logic of the Declaration on the Right to Development was unassailable. The requirements of the right to development were putting the human person at the centre of development, active, free and meaningful participation, non-discrimination, fair distribution of the benefits of the development process, sovereignty over national resources and advancement of all other human rights. The right to development called for a human rights-based approach to development. It was not about charity but accountability attached to particular right holders and duty-bearers, which are primarily the States. The international community was also responsible for international cooperation and solidarity. The Declaration also explicitly defined the common obstacles for development, such as massive violation of human rights, apartheid, foreign occupation and threats of war. He added that the principle elements of the Declaration were already established in international human rights instruments and included concepts that had long been codified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Charter of the United Nations and human rights treaties. In the light of the global financial crisis, there was a need to reform the international financial and economic mechanisms. He argued that resources to eradicate poverty surely could be found, given the billions used to bail out banks.

16. Kishore Singh, Special Rapporteur on the right to education, underlined the conceptual linkages between the right to education and the right to development. Both rights embodied the fundamental principle of equality of opportunity, as well as entitlement and empowerment. The empowering role of the right to education contributed to the realization of the right to development. As an agenda for development, education that was both broad based and flexible could be a driving force for the realization of development. Mr. Singh also pinpointed the importance of education as a tool of poverty reduction. There was a need to shift focus to quality of education which enabled individuals to contribute to development. Education was essential for accelerating progress towards all MDGs. Therefore education should be considered a priority in the United Nations development

agenda. Giving some practical examples of how the right to education promotes the right to development, Mr. Singh also highlighted challenges in advancing the right to education in a development perspective.

17. The statement by the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights, Magdalena Sepulveda, was read out by Yoonie Kim, OHCHR staff supporting the mandate. It emphasized that the Declaration on the Right to Development had laid the cornerstone for a participatory development process. One of the biggest challenges to the realization of the right was the alarming rise in inequality, between and within countries. Social protection systems put the human person at the centre of the development process, had mitigating effects and promoted enjoyment of rights. The Special Rapporteur emphasized participation in social protection systems as a key human right in itself and the key to the effectiveness of development policies. Full realization of the right to development depended on empowerment of women; policymakers should devote increased attention to gender equality. International assistance and cooperation was the lynchpin in the realization of the right to development. She suggested that States should consider a financial transaction tax in order to recover the cost of the economic crisis. The governance of financial institutions had to be more inclusive, more representative and more open.

18. Virginia Dandan, independent expert on human rights and international solidarity, underlined that international solidarity should be an indispensable component of efforts to realize the right to development, which could help to lessen the gap between developed and developing countries by buttressing rhetoric and declarations with tangible actions. International solidarity as a human right connected diverse people into a harmonious whole. Ms. Dandan underlined the importance of listening to the voice of the people. There was a need to go beyond expectations and seek and learn how development and well-being were defined by people themselves. Achieving the MDGs and the right to development would call for a more enlightened approach based on a sense of community and international solidarity. Much could be learned from everyday people, who lived their lives in community, addressed their problems and eventually found solutions, coming together in solidarity, in the exercise of their right to development.

19. During the ensuing interactive debate, interventions were made by representatives of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Institute Maria de Don Bosco, Cuba, Qatar, the Association Communitar Mercedes, North-South XXI, the Association of World Citizens, Housing and Land Rights Network, Ecuador and Egypt. It was mentioned that the right to development reinforced the message that only an equitable, multilateral system that worked for both developed and developing countries alike could help achieve MDGs and other development goals. Human rights were an intrinsic part of development. Mainstreaming human rights into development using a human rights-based approach added value when analysing the structural causes of poverty, increasing the understanding of who was excluded and why. This approach was conceptually underpinned by the right to development, which should be viewed of as a set of enabling policies, principles and procedures that had evolved from three decades of development practice and embodied the consensus of international community today. The importance of quality education for achieving the right to development was underlined. Concern was expressed over the increasing number of people suffering from hunger, malnutrition and poverty, the limited transfer of technology, usually with conditionality, the contraction of official development assistance, the impact of the global crises on developing countries and the impact of unilateral coercive measures. There was a need for international cooperation genuinely aimed at achieving all human rights, promoting economic development and disarmament. National efforts for the realization of the right to development were shared by the speakers. There was a need to remove obstacles to development, including asymmetries in the global market, the failing liberal economic model and exploitation of natural resources, and to resolve conflict and war. Human rights had to be at the centre of the fight against extreme

poverty. Recognizing international solidarity was important to better monitor MDG 8. There was a need to provide the right to development with a legally binding framework for its implementation. More generally, concern was expressed over the insufficient progress in the realization of the right to development, imbalanced global governance and the pressure from industrialized countries on developing countries to open up or privatize their markets. Concern was also expressed that despite 25 years of efforts, little had been achieved in terms of policy prescriptions for States, and that human rights implementation proved more difficult today than before. The need for dialogue and understanding on the right to development was underlined. In order to boost the right to development it was necessary to generate the necessary conditions for sustainable and sporadic development, foster international consensus and respect commitments made. Concern was also expressed over the gap between recognition and implementation of rights. While the important role of civil society was underlined, it was also stressed that the primary duty-bearer for the creation of a national and international enabling environment rested with States.

20. In their concluding remarks, the panellists focused on specific questions. As concerned the added value of the right to development, it was argued that the focus on the human being as the centre of the development process was essential. International solidarity could help in establishing an enabling environment for the realization of the right to development. The importance of practical examples of how education could contribute to development was underlined. In that context, reference was made to the importance of benchmarks in the field of education, good-quality secondary and basic education, the importance of education for sustainable development, as well as the importance of international assistance and cooperation in the field of development. To make further progress in the realization of the right to development, there was a need to reach out to ordinary people and to mobilize civil society for the right to development. It was also necessary to mainstream the right to development jointly with all other rights in the work of relevant agencies. Progress was being made in terms of commitment to bringing development and human rights together, activities at the grass-roots level and claiming the right to active, free and meaningful participation. While States were the primary duty-bearers under the Declaration on the Right to Development, international cooperation and the reform of the international economic and financial system was equally important. Concern over inadequate implementation of the right to development could also be made with human rights more generally; indeed it was currently a difficult period for promoting human rights.

B. Measures and actions needed to make the right to development a reality for everyone at the local, national, regional and international levels, including the role and contribution of civil society and non-governmental organizations

1. Legal and social action strategies and the right to development

21. Wilson Kipsang Kipkazi, Endorois Welfare Council, speaking on the Endorois struggle for recognition and development, described the history of the eviction of the Endorois community and their legal struggle, which ultimately led to a decision of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, recognizing inter alia a violation of the right to development by the Kenyan authorities in 2010. He elaborated on the efforts made by the Endorois after the decision was adopted and the challenges and needs of the Endorois Welfare Council. The key implementation challenges were to: (a) ensure that the Endorois community has unrestricted access to Lake Bogoria and surrounding sites for religious and cultural purposes and for cattle-grazing; (b) payment of adequate compensation for loss suffered and royalties from existing economic activities and to ensure

that the Endorois benefit from employment possibilities within the reserve; and (c) to engage in dialogue with the complainants for the effective implementation of these recommendations.

22. Paul Kipyegen Chepsoi, Endorois Welfare Council, speaking on the realization of social justice, human rights and access to basic education, noted the challenges to minority rights protection. He particularly highlighted the importance of recognition as a minority group for effective protection of minority rights and referred to legislative developments in Kenya in that regard. To better protect minority rights, he recommended: legal recognition of minorities; strengthening the capacity of minorities and of staff working with minority communities on indigenous issues; ensuring access to basic education for minorities; improving health-care services; paying special attention to children with disabilities; providing employment opportunities to the youth; and ensuring security of all in conflict-prone zones.

23. Lucy Claridge, Head of Law, Minorities Rights Group International, speaking on litigating the right to development, elaborated in detail on the aforementioned decision of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, which had established a violation of the right to development. The decision made clear that both substantive and procedural requirements, if violated, constituted a violation of the right to development. The decision found that five criteria must be fulfilled for a process to meet the requirements of the right to development: it must be an equitable, non-discriminatory, participatory, accountable and transparent process, with equity and choice as overarching themes. The decision further clarified that the right to development, under the African Charter of Human and Peoples' Rights, was justiciable; clarified the duty of the nation State; specified that development was not just economic and not just national development; put emphasis on the process as well as the outcome, with a particular emphasis on participation; and underlined the importance of choice and well-being. Ms. Claridge recommended invoking the right to development more routinely. She also underlined the duties of non-State actors, in particular business companies with regard to the respect of the right to development of indigenous peoples.

24. Miloon Kothari, Director, Housing and Land Rights Network, speaking on land eviction and the right to development, focused on market-based evictions, their causes and common features. Those evicted were not usually given prior notice and evictions were undertaken without consultations and sharing of relevant information; there was no participatory decision-making process, there was lack of housing alternatives and excessive force was used while carrying out these evictions. He called attention on the lack of public outrage vis-à-vis such evictions. He also drew attention to "mega-energy" corridors, which were in blatant violation of the right to development. Alarming, Governments invoked the right to development and MDG 7 to justify evictions. The use of "public interest" for justifying evictions should be challenged and speculation in land and real estate stopped; more broadly, what is at its root, neoliberal economic policies should be challenged.

25. Bret Thiele, Co-executive Director, Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, emphasized how strategic litigation and other forms of legal advocacy could support the human rights-based approach to development, which also provided the means by which rights-holders could shape jurisprudence from the perspective of marginalized or vulnerable groups and thus help define human rights standards and hold actors accountable. He recommended increasing the use of legal advocacy; supporting universal ratification of international human rights treaties, especially the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; and finding ways to better utilize the treaty bodies. As concerned the post-2015 MDG framework, Mr. Thiele suggested that, in order to truly promote the right to development, it was necessary to

expressly incorporate the human rights-based approach to development as an explicit and central pillar of the post-2015 development paradigm.

26. During the ensuing interactive debate, interventions were made by the independent expert on human rights and international solidarity, the Asian Legal Resource Centre, the Special Rapporteur on the right to education, Social Watch, Morocco, the Institute for Social and Economic Studies, the Association for World Citizens, the International Movement ATD Fourth World, Algeria, the Secretariat of the African Decade of Persons with Disabilities and Uruguay. Attention was drawn to the possibility of relying on treaty bodies and the universal periodic review mechanism as means to seek implementation of decisions adopted by regional human rights mechanisms, such as in the case of the Endorois. It was underlined that the issue of the right to development could not be separated from good governance, the anti-corruption campaign and accountability. It was discussed whether or not there was a need for a new development framework after 2015, and what could be done to make such a framework compliant with human rights including the right to development. Highlighting the case of evictions in the context of major sporting events and in the name of development and the foreign direct investment associated therewith, one speaker stressed a need to confront this issue in parallel with challenging prevailing neoliberal economic policies. It was specified that good-quality education also meant education relevant to the needs of the population so as to achieve its potential to empower people to realize their right to development. International solidarity was not only relevant in North-South cooperation but also South-South cooperation. It was acknowledged that policies and legislation were not sufficient for achieving the right to development. Achieving that also required practical implementation strategies, knowledgeable personnel and sufficient budgetary allocations.

27. In concluding remarks, the panellists argued, *inter alia*, that the human rights-based approach brought deeper specificity to the right to development; it could be seen as a framework to advocate the right to development. With regard to “public interest”, it was suggested that a public interest analysis needed to infuse a human rights analysis. As concerned the issue of corruption and impunity and their impact on human rights, it was pointed out that, in cases where multilateral or bilateral donors were involved, leveraging them could be a practical strategy for ensuring human rights compliance and seeking accountability. In order to influence the post-MDG development framework, it was necessary to speak with one voice for a human rights-based approach. In that context, it was also underlined that the Millennium Declaration contained very strong human rights language, which should be brought back to the discussions of the new development agenda. The view was expressed that a new framework was not needed – reaffirming the commitments made under human rights instruments would suffice. However, it was also acknowledged that a post-2015 MDG framework was likely inevitable and thus the need to push for express inclusions of human rights standards was crucial. The need for a fundamental rethinking of the use of energy, consumption patterns and of economic policies was underlined. One of the main concerns with large-scale energy projects, even if they involved renewable forms of energy production, was that they did not often benefit the people living in the affected areas. Such projects often involve high-levels of corruption and lack accountability. On the question of the need for a legally binding instrument on the right to development, the need to focus on implementation was stressed, while the debate continued on whether a binding normative framework was required. It was recognized that many elements of the right to development were already included in legally binding instruments and some were already recognized as customary international law.

2. Social justice and the right to development

28. Kudakwakshe Dube, Chief Executive Officer, Secretariat of the African Decade for Persons with Disabilities, highlighted that development had to improve living conditions

and empower disabled persons to realize their potential. But, in practice, access to resources had been denied to them. In developing countries, the situation was worse because of the poor social and economic conditions. From a human rights perspective, development problems must address disabilities, and many institutions now applied a human rights-based approach. It was only by empowering all that poverty could be reduced and the MDGs achieved. Applying a human rights-based approach to development and disability was about removing barriers and changing attitudes. Regrettably, programming processes often did not take disability into account and there was a general lack of knowledge around the issue and political will.

29. Fareda Banda, Professor, School of Oriental and African Studies, expressed concern at the slow progress in terms of development for women. She referred to the various normative achievements in relation to women and development. Women continued to bear the burden of child-rearing and day-to-day life. Maternal mortality remained a pressing concern. Development programmes that were not sensitive to issues of gender often had a more adverse impact on women, for instance, in relation to access to water and sanitation. She particularly referred to the Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights on the Rights of Women, adopted in 2003, which came close to indicating exactly what development and sustainable development should look like for women. Ms. Banda highlighted the need to implement article 8 of the Declaration on the Right to Development. In her view, there was no need to introduce new normative frameworks but instead to consider how existing policies and standards could take effect.

30. Hector Alejandro, International Movement ATD Fourth World, speaking on young people seeking to restore human rights, underlined the importance of listening to the voice of the poor. He referred to his personal experience and to the ATD Fourth World street library project, through which much was discovered about the lives of the local young people and their social problems. Through this project, young people also came to discover the realities of their country. It was important to factor the voices of poor people, especially the youth, into laws and policies. The poor had to be recognized as actors for change. It was also important to see the impact of underdevelopment and poverty on communities. In order to achieve real development, it was necessary to develop and strengthen holistic policies. Change must affect the daily lives of people. There must be dialogue among all concerned, so that everyone's realities could be taken into account.

31. The above presentations were followed by an interactive debate with interventions by representatives of Qatar, the Association of World Citizens and Mexico. The interventions described national efforts to realize the right to development, highlighting in particular measures to empower women and strengthen the equality of men and women. Another example drew attention to community efforts leading to an increase in public health spending. Another national experience built on the notion of implementing development as a human right, aimed at sustainable human development.

32. In concluding remarks, the panellists expressed, *inter alia*, concern over the need for a legally binding instrument on the right to development. It was underlined that services provided by institutions to persons with disabilities were not met once they returned to live in their communities, which posed a problem. As concerned the element of participation, it was highlighted that persons with disabilities positioned themselves as economic and social players; they wanted to be productive and participate. In Africa, much progress had been made in the sphere of political participation of disabled persons, and there were many persons with disabilities in governmental and political positions. It was recommended that all countries ratify the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. As concerned the possibility of elaborating an African protocol for persons with disabilities, care should be taken not to compromise global standards. In implementing international standards, it was important to internalize their provisions, understand them, break down the content of

the convention, build capacity for implementation, facilitate dialogue, prioritize and provide assistance.

3. Innovative approaches to participation and accountability in development

33. Iara Pietricovsky Oliviera, Institute for Social and Economic Studies, speaking on public budgets and human rights – a Brazilian experience of enhancing social participation in public policymaking, explained the role played by intellectuals, indigenous peoples and civil society groups in enhancing democracy and participatory development. The Brazilian public debt, tax justice and development model posed new challenges to realizing human rights. The Institute for Social and Economic Studies had been active in the transition to democracy and had developed a public budget and human rights approach whereby public budget analysis was used to consider key questions including participation in development, distribution of its benefits, rights and freedoms, and collection and distribution of public funds. She explained the process and methodology in public budget analysis and presented a new project within which youth were educated and empowered in human rights and public budget, especially through workshops and art education.

34. Zoe Young, independent filmmaker and participatory video consultant, speaking on using video letters and participatory media in development, pointed out that the word “development” came from a word that meant “unfolding”. The right to development depended on space to move and grow and also the elements of life – water, air and energy. She explained the origin of participatory video-making in the search for ways to bring the voice of marginalized people and communities to the table. The added value was that communities themselves created the message, using modern communications and technology, assisted by media trainers. Obstacles of distance and language could now be transcended at minimum expense, and participatory communication responded to the need and desire for people to be represented in their own terms. She underlined that participatory video was an innovative and cost-effective way of engaging with difficult issues of accountability, empowerment and sustainability in securing the right to development.

35. Jimmy Kereseka, community activist, speaking on participatory video in practice in the Solomon Islands, presented an example of a participatory video used to promote sustainable ecosystem management and development and community adaptation to climate impacts, with participatory decision-making and planning. Working with the Lauru Land Conference of Tribal Community, a local NGO based in Choiseul, the communities there were cooperating to manage their marine and forest resources, especially motivated by their vulnerability to climate change.

36. David Gunn, Incidental, and Lyno Vuth, Sa Sa Art Projects, addressed the issue of culture and development, using on the example of the Neak Ta project in Cambodia. They argued that participation was a key element in art as well as development. In Cambodia, the development of art had also been influenced by international donors and organizations, and thus represented their interests, which focused on traditional forms of culture, leaving modern forms neglected. Mr. Gunn described Neak Ta, a contemporary project on culture and development. Cultural projects could offer space to identity and be emotionally enabling. He underlined the importance of challenging authenticity and suggested that knowledge of other ways of being could be promoted through the medium of cultural projects. Mr. Vuth remarked on how investors aimed to modernize and privatize *The Phnom Penh Post* and argued that interlinking rights-based development and artistic freedom in an experimental and participatory approach allowed identity to be explored and space to be created to enable artists to look at Cambodian culture. Mr. Gunn suggested a genuine reflection on the interface of culture and development and the way culture could critique, contribute to and interact with development, resisting imposed identities. In his view, cultural projects had much to offer in fostering understanding and addressing the cultural

and emotional impact of development. They allowed new forms of collaborative interactions to be shaped.

37. The above presentations were followed by interventions from representatives of Housing and Land Rights Network, the Association of World Citizens and the Special Rapporteur on the right to education. It was pointed out that work on budgets was widespread. The question was asked whether budget related analysis could effectively change the neoliberal system, policies and address inequalities. As concerned participatory video, it was pointed out that it was difficult to capture human rights violations for practical reasons and difficult to screen participatory videos on mainstream channels. It was pointed out that budget allocations to education had to be commensurate to the importance of the right to education for development.

38. In concluding remarks, the panellists answered specific questions addressed to them. In response to a question on the use of specific art forms, it was pointed out that community-based art projects gave space to the communities involved to decide on the form of activity. The point was made that participatory video enabled people to specify what development meant to them. While communities might not even be aware of the right to development, young people worldwide were already using communications technology to express their concerns. It was argued that technology was increasingly present to capture human rights violations but with the risk that only certain perspectives were represented, so agencies had a role in facilitating training for rights and equity. As concerned the impact of budget analysis on broader macroeconomic policies, it was pointed out that the prevailing model could only be changed through a change of mindset. It was important to mobilize people, especially the youth, to induce a culture of policy change based on human rights.

C. International assistance and cooperation, as well as the promotion of an enabling environment for the realization of the right to development

1. International institutional framework: an enabling environment for the right to development

39. Zeljka Kozul Wright, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, provided an overview of the *2010 Least Developed Countries Report: Towards a New International Development Architecture for LDCs*.⁴ She underlined that globalization led, in the case of LDCs, to heightened economic volatility and rise in inequality. Even in countries with strong economic growth, progress towards achieving the MDGs lagged. LDCs were dependent on export of commodities and raw industrial materials and labour-intensive manufacturing and faced with malnutrition and food insecurity. Structural weaknesses were compounded by weaknesses of the global architecture. LDCs were vulnerable to external shocks with limited capacity to raise productivity. In the light of those realities, the new international development architecture called for more inclusive governance, in the areas of finance, trade, commodities, technology, climate change and South-South cooperation. It was a comprehensive development framework consisting of five pillars: the international financial architecture, including aid and debt relief regime and capital flows; the multilateral trade regime; the commodity regime; the knowledge architecture, including technology transfer and acquisition; and the regime for mitigation and reparation of climate change. The objectives of the new architecture are to support domestic resource mobilization and places emphasis on greater ownership, autonomy and policy space.

⁴ United Nations publication, Sales No. E.10.II.D.5.

40. Paul Quintos, IBON Foundation, speaking on Rio+20 and development challenges, expressed the view that the Declaration on the Right to Development was an advocacy tool for a more equitable and democratic international order. In his view, a comprehensive and multifaceted development advocacy campaign could be built around the concept of the right to development, allowing linkages to a wide range of issues, such as poverty eradication, food sovereignty, ecological/climate justice and national sovereignty. The campaign could be advanced at the national and international levels, targeting national Governments, regional bodies, international organizations and transnational actors to hold them to account. In his view, the potential of the Declaration on the Right to Development, as well as that of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development remain unrealized, with continuing strain on the environment and retrogression with regard to the principle of common but differentiated responsibility. To promote the right to development and the Rio principles, Mr. Quintos recommended the use of the occasion of Rio+20 to promote a human rights-based approach to sustainable development. Demonstrating the relevance of the right to development to issues such as energy, food and water security would raise the utility of the right to development for social mobilization and civil society advocacy. Mr. Quintos called upon the United Nations agencies to engage more aggressively in policy advocacy. There was a need to re-examine values and lifestyles, conceptions of the good life, social relations and relationship with nature.

41. Shabalala Dalindyabo, Maastricht University, speaking on climate change, human rights and intellectual property, underlined that the right to development was a core element of the climate change legal regime. It was the basis for developing countries' demand for transfer of technology, part of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol. In practice, unfortunately, that transfer of technology was not taking place. The main constraining reasons were intellectual property regimes and the unwillingness of developed countries to fulfil their obligations. Mr. Dalindyabo pointed to the conflict of norms between the trade and human rights regime and the expanding power of the World Trade Organization (WTO), combined with limiting applicable law in the WTO dispute settlement mechanism. The approach followed by the International Law Commission when dealing with fragmentation of international law, namely "systemic integration" could help address potential conflicts that arose as a result of the diversification and expansion of international law. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change could provide direction and guidance on how that could happen in real terms to take into account other regimes through impact assessments. The other question related to that was of course whether or not the respective body was competent and had a mandate to consider norms belonging to a different regime.

42. Fried Didden, Kosovo Health Foundation, introduced the work of the Kosovo Health Foundation, a non-profit organization working on mental and reproductive health. He also provided a description of the environment in which the organization was operating, the legal and factual constraints attached to the health service system in Kosovo,⁵ the financial constraints and the lack of transparency and participation in the distribution of national resources but also in the allocation of international donor resources.

43. In the ensuing interactive debate, representatives of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, the Housing and Land Rights Network, the Association of World Citizens, Egypt, North-South XXI, the Global Network for the Right to Development and the Institute for Social and Economic Studies took the floor. It was said that international cooperation should be strengthened without imposing conditions or obligations on

⁵ All references to Kosovo, whether to the territory, institutions or population, shall be understood in the context of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999), and without prejudice to the status of Kosovo.

developing countries. Concern was expressed that UNCTAD had not incorporated the human rights-based approach into its work, which would have improved the analysis in its LDC reports. As concerns the relationship between the human rights-based approach and the right to development, it was pointed out that the latter differed in the focus it placed on the international dimension. There was a need for deeper discussion on how the right to development could support dialogue on emerging thinking on structural change and causes, as opposed to addressing the symptoms of global inequality. There was a need to move towards positive forms of cooperation and to go beyond aid towards systemic policy coherence.

44. In concluding remarks and addressing specific questions, the panellists *inter alia* reiterated the importance of systemic integration of various sets of norms in the trade arena. Reference was made to the World Intellectual Property Organization Development Agenda as a successful transformation from a purely technical body to a body looking at systemic integration, although the practical limitations to that agenda were pointed out. Concern was shared that the discussions for Rio+20 appeared to be retrogressive, challenging formerly agreed principles, such as the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. With regard to the question on the difference between the human rights-based approach and the right to development, it was argued that the human rights-based approach focused on the needs of individuals rather than making the argument about State responsibility. The need for greater human rights-based policy coherence was underlined in order to achieve sustainable development in its social, environmental and economic dimensions. It was argued that, in order to mainstream a human rights-based approach into the work of UNCTAD, a mandate from Member States was needed. It was argued that the human rights framework at present was not fully developed or operational, and required significantly more work in order to become an operational tool in economic analysis.

2. Financing for development

45. Roberto Bissio, Social Watch, speaking on the future of the multilateral aid system and debt relief, explored – on the basis of available data – the differences in development, understood as economic growth versus social development. He referred to recently published data dispelling arguments that there was a need for inequality in order to achieve growth and that growth would eventually lead to redistribution. He pointed to a number of obstacles to realizing the right to development and economic, social and cultural rights and the enforcement mechanisms that were lacking.

46. Andrea Shemberg, legal consultant, speaking on principles for responsible contracts and integrating human rights risks into investment contract negotiations, suggested viewing human rights as a positive element protecting policy space. She referred to the Guiding principles on Business and Human rights and their protect, respect and remedy framework, as well as to the principles for responsible contracts, which aimed at providing a framework for integrating human rights in investment treaties. In her view, there was progress being achieved in the area, but capacity-building was needed. In addition, although a contract might be in line with the principles, that was not a guarantee that investment projects would bring about positive results.

47. Aldo Caliarì, Center of Concern, speaking on regulating finance as if human rights really mattered, argued that the recent crises challenged the presumptions relating to State regulation and intervention in financial policies and that the field had been traditionally reserved to elitist expert discussions. Indeed, it was a debate that concerned society as a whole and society thus had to have a say; certainly the human rights community also had its own stake in these debates. He called upon human rights actors to more actively engage in financial regulatory debates and with the relevant actors and bodies. In addition, Mr. Caliarì

addressed the issue of “too big to fail” and the regulation of derivative markets through a human rights lens.

48. Gabrielle Marceau, World Trade Organization, speaking on connecting trade, development effectiveness and human rights, argued that the debate on human rights and the world trade rules dated back to at least 1999. In her view, the world trade rules, the right to development and human rights in general shared the same values and principles. Trade was needed to create revenue to bring about economic growth. However, economic growth alone did not bring economic justice automatically. Ms. Marceau referred to the Doha round negotiations and the rules specifically targeting LDCs, according to which they were only required to make commitments consistent with their economic and administrative capacities. It was not the mandate of WTO to look into the equitable sharing of benefits from trade. Transparency obligations were in place and Governments should report how they spend benefits of trade. Ms. Marceau reported that there were gaps and that the WTO Director-General had set up a section dealing with human rights and trade. She underlined the need for close collaboration with the human rights community to allow trade to grow in the right direction towards social justice and implementation of the right to development. In her view, there were no legal impediments to taking human rights law into consideration, indeed this was already happening, for example, in the context of intellectual property law and in agriculture.

49. Jane Nalunga, Southern and Eastern African Trade Information and Negotiations Institute, speaking on understanding the implications of multilateral and bilateral trade agreements on the right to development and social welfare in Uganda, argued that trade agreements impacted on all aspects of life. Under the WTO regime, member States were obliged to abide to all agreements in a single undertaking. The decision process was undemocratic and unfair, largely determined by developed countries. All national laws had to be WTO compliant. Most developing countries lacked the capacity to take advantage of the existing flexibilities under WTO law, sometimes they were not used in order to attract investors or through donor pressure. WTO had a retaliation and sanctions mechanism, which did not exist under the human rights framework. The principal reason for the stalling of the Doha round concerned the structural inequalities in WTO. The trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights (TRIPS) primarily protected corporate interests. Problems resulting from protection of intellectual property included food security, access to medicines and education and transfer of technology. There was the need to ensure the protection of human rights in all multilateral and bilateral trade agreements and to reform the WTO and trade negotiating systems.

50. Tenu Avafia, United Nations Development Programme, addressed the role of intellectual property in facilitating or impeding access to pharmaceutical products, in particular for the treatment of HIV/AIDS. Prior to the existence of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Including Trade in Counterfeit Goods, countries had more flexibility to shape national intellectual property laws. The TRIPS agreement restricted that policy space to three groups of flexibilities, namely preventative, remedial and enforcement flexibilities. He encouraged countries to make use of these existing flexibilities and noted that it was important to provide assistance and guidance to countries on how best to make use thereof. He expressed concern over the provisions of TRIPS-plus agreements contained in free trade or other bilateral trade agreements under which developing countries’ use of these flexibilities might be compromised.

51. Representatives of the Housing and Land Rights Network, Egypt, Qatar, the Association for World Citizens, Cuba, the Russian Federation, Egypt (on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement) and North-South XXI made interventions. Concern was expressed over the existing parallel legal structures and the question was raised how best to dismantle them. There was a need to create an enabling environment through international solidarity and

international cooperation, introducing structural and systemic reform, participation, accountability and human rights principles. The aim should be to apply a development approach to human rights. National efforts in providing aid and financing for development were described. The principles of transparency, participation and accountability in elaborating development policies and the role of civil society were stressed. Concern was expressed over the different meanings of “non-discrimination” in the trade and human rights regimes. The need for more coherence, understanding and acceptance of human rights in WTO was underlined. Questions were raised how the right to development could help in revamping what remained of the Doha round, linked with the role of trade and financial institutions within the broader picture of incorporating the right to development into the collective responsibility of States.

52. In concluding remarks and addressing specific questions, the panellists, inter alia, pointed out that human rights obligations should be used as leverage when addressing imbalances in trade, finance and economic regimes. They could empower States to claim the policy space needed. More work had to be done in the area of arbitration in disputes arising from investment agreements. Arbitrators need to technically know how to use the human rights framework in the context of investment agreements. A number of practical strategies in the area of TRIPS flexibilities were mentioned as potential avenues for replication in order to ensure the right to health. It was pointed out that the non-discrimination provisions in WTO allowed for flexibilities and included specific provisions for LDCs. It was further noted that the WTO regime limited and regulated the use of counter-measures employed under general public international law.

53. Felix Kirchmeier, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, presented his concluding views on the Social Forum. He pointed out that the Social Forum was conceived of as a space for civil society. This was unfortunately not matched with the power for civil society organizations to table resolutions on the outcome of the Social Forum sessions. He encouraged the Human Rights Council to discuss the recommendations in substance and take action on them. As concerned the 2011 Social Forum, he concluded that, while the Declaration on the Right to Development was recognized as a forceful tool with the potential to readjust existing power imbalances in international relations, to date it had had little impact. While the right to development meant many things for many people, and indeed had a wide reach, for rights-holders it was about effectively changing, or preserving, their situation at a very local level.

54. The Chairperson-Rapporteur in his closing remarks summarized key findings and conclusions of the Social Forum which are reflected below.

IV. Conclusions and recommendations

A. Conclusions

55. **The right to development provided an integrated, holistic and cohesive framework, applying human rights to the national and international dimensions of development. The multi-dimensional aspect of the right to development was emphasized, moving beyond economic growth to achieving well-being of populations, social inclusion and justice. Normative frameworks were already in place in relation to many of the elements of right to development: existing human rights mechanisms and provisions needed to be utilized and the right to development had to be invoked more routinely by employing strategic litigation and legal advocacy. This would provide the means by which rights-holders could shape jurisprudence from the perspective of marginalized or vulnerable groups and thus help define human rights standards and hold actors accountable.**

56. Particular attention should be paid to the crucial role of free, active and meaningful participation in the development process including by women, persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples, minorities, children and youth, utilizing existing and available normative instruments. The principle of free, prior and informed consent of affected communities should be respected at all stages of development decision-making. New and innovative tools and approaches to participation were encouraged, such as public budget monitoring, participatory video and other means by which individuals reclaim control over both the form and content of participation, as well as experimental and improvisational cultural processes.

57. Civil society has to take the lead as the engine for the realization of the right to development. Wider space for civil society and an enabling environment for active civil society engagement was a critical element of the right to development. Civil society organizations had a legitimate role at the micro, meso and macro levels, and should not be seen purely in terms of service delivery.

58. International cooperation, international solidarity, the role of culture and the right to education were all essential in achieving the right to development and in creating an enabling environment for its realization. It was stressed that obstacles to development had to be eliminated, including addressing asymmetries in the global market, the failing dominant economic model, financial regulation through a human rights lens, exploitation of natural resources, and conflict and war. There was a need for political will, both at national and international levels and a need for human rights-based policy coherence.

59. A new compact for development cooperation should emphasize more inclusive aid architecture, effective State institutions, climate finance, aid for trade, and the private sector. Human rights must be at the heart of any new development cooperation architecture, advocating operationalization of a right to development framework, policy coherence, accountability and civil society participation.

60. The preamble to the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization provides that “sustainable development” is a goal of the organization together with the need for positive efforts designed to ensure that developing countries, secure a share in the growth in international trade commensurate with their economic and sustainable development needs. However, other participants pointed out that multilateral and bilateral trade agreements and the resultant trade arrangements had far-reaching and often adverse implications on the realization of person’s right to development in low-income countries. Multidimensional aspects of the right to development and all human rights must be mainstreamed in the programmes of United Nations bodies, such as the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, and other international organizations such as the World Trade Organization and the World Intellectual Property Organization, and into all thematic agenda of the international community; such aspect include climate change and justice, LDCs, trade and investments, education and culture, etc.

B. Recommendations

61. The Human Rights Council should advance the right to development in parallel with intergovernmental processes and the building of a wider constituency through encouraging the broadest participation of civil society and all other relevant stakeholders in promoting the right to development.

62. Implementation of the right to development is enhanced through a range of measures at national, regional and global levels that aim at promoting social and

environmental justice, accountability and justiciability. Additional means should be identified to hold national and international actors accountable, and to employ new instruments or better utilize existing tools for strengthening the justiciability of the right to development.

63. Efforts are made to utilize the right to development as a normative framework for policy coherence and systemic integration in international law, by deploying an array of regulatory mechanisms and instruments while ensuring participation of civil society as development actors through multi-stakeholder mechanisms.

64. Governments create and support secure, inclusive and innovative avenues and forms of free, active and meaningful participation and empowerment for development decision-making. Public budget monitoring was recognized as an important tool to promote the right to development. Such monitoring would consider key questions, including participation in development, distribution of its benefits, rights and freedoms and collection and distribution of public funds.

65. Debates on achievement of MDGs and any post-2015 development vision must explicitly incorporate multidimensional aspects of the right to development and all human rights. There is a need to focus on implementing existing human rights obligations at the core of development agendas.

66. Consideration is given to the proposal of the levy of a financial transaction tax that would ensure that resources generated are allocated to poverty alleviation and development.

67. The occasion of Earth Summit 2012 should be seized upon as an opportunity to focus on the mutually reinforcing pillars of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development and the Declaration on the Right to Development and ensure that right to development is advanced through Rio+20.

68. The Human Rights Council should take the lead in mainstreaming multidimensional aspects of the right to development and all human rights in the mandate and programmes of all United Nations bodies and other intergovernmental organizations; and in making use of the right to development and all human rights as analytical tools in policymaking.

Annexes

Annex I

Provisional agenda

1. Opening of the session.
2. Implementation of Human Rights Council resolution 16/26 entitled “The Social Forum”:
 - (a) Promotion and effective realization of the right to development in the context of the commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Right to Development;
 - (b) Measures and actions needed to make the right to development a reality for everyone at the local, national, regional and international levels, including the role and contribution of civil society and non-governmental organizations;
 - (c) International assistance and cooperation, as well as the promotion of an enabling environment for the realization of the right to development.
3. Closure of the session.

Annex II

[English only]

List of participants

States Members of the Human Rights Council

Bangladesh, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Italy, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Russian Federation, Senegal, Uganda, United States of America, Uruguay.

States Members of the United Nations represented by observers

Algeria, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Japan, Kenya, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Serbia, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Syria, Turkey, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen.

Non-Member States represented by observers

Holy See.

Intergovernmental organizations

Organization of Islamic Cooperation.

United Nations

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.

Specialized agencies and related organizations

World Trade Organization.

Non-governmental organizations

African Committee of Experts on the Rights and Welfare of the Child of the African Union, African Decade of Persons with Disabilities, Aelios Life Association, Association Point-Coeur, Associazione Comunità Papa Giovanni XXIII, BetterAid, Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network, Center of Concern, Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, Endorois Welfare Council, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Global Network for the Right to Development, Greenpeace International, Housing and Land Rights Network, IBON Foundation, International Council of Women, International Investment Centre(IIC), International Movement ATD Fourth World, International Network on the Prevention of Elder Abuse,

International Secretariat of Social Watch, International Sustainable Energy Organisation for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency, International Volunteerism Organization for Women, Education and Development, Kosovo Health Foundation, Media21, Minorities Rights Group International, International Organization for the Right to Education and Freedom of Education, Rencontre Africaine pour la Défense des Droits de l'Homme, Rethinking Bretton Woods Project, Southern and Eastern African Trade Information and Negotiations Institute, Tchad Agir pour l'environnement, World Circle of the Consensus..

Academic institutions

International Institute of Social Studies, Institute for Social and Economic Studies, The Hague, School of Oriental and African Studies of the University of London, Maastricht University Faculty of Law.

Independent experts

Virginia Dandan, independent expert on human rights and international solidarity, David Gunn, Incidental, Jimmy Kereseke, community activist; Magdalena Sepulveda, Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights, Andrea Shemberg, legal consultant, Kishore Singh, Special Rapporteur on the right to education, Lyno Vuth, Sa Sa Art Project; Zoe Young, independent filmmaker.
