



THE HUMAN RIGHTS INSTITUTE



University of
Connecticut

Economic Rights Working Paper Series

The Metrics of Human Rights: Complementarities of the Human Development and Capabilities Approach

Sakiko Fukuda-Parr
The New School

Working Paper 14

November 2010

The Human Rights Institute
University of Connecticut
Thomas J. Dodd Research Center
405 Babbidge Road, U-1205
Storrs, CT, 06269, USA

Email: humanrights@uconn.edu
Tel: 860-486-8739
Fax: 860-486-6332
<http://www.humanrights.uconn.edu/>

Abstract

Capabilities and human rights are closely related and share common commitments to freedom and justice as central political objectives. Much of the literature on this relationship has focused on defining the overlaps and differences between them as theoretical concepts. This paper explores a different aspect of the relationship, namely the overlaps and differences in their respective measurement approaches. The paper argues that human development indicators that are used to evaluate policies for capability expansion, or human development, cannot substitute for human rights indicators because of the differences in them as concepts as well as the way that these concepts are used and applied. Human rights indicators are used to assess the accountability of the state in complying with the obligations that are codified in international and domestic law. However, the literature of development economics and the methods of empirical analysis and aggregative summary measurements extensively used in the human development and capabilities (HD/C) approach can overcome some of the constraints of conventional methods used in human rights assessments. These possibilities are illustrated in the Economic and Social Rights Fulfillment Index, recently developed by Fukuda-Parr, Lawson-Remer and Randolph that conceptualizes an empirical model of progressive realization and provides an empirical basis for setting benchmarks.

Keywords: capability approach, human development, Sen, Nussbaum, human rights indicators, rights based approach to development, progressive realisation

I am grateful to comments from the coeditors of this special issue, two anonymous reviewers, and for research assistance from Kelly Gannon. This paper has also benefitted greatly from collaborative work with Susan Randolph and Terra Lawson-Remer over the last 3 years on human rights measurement. The usual disclaimers apply.

The Economic Rights Working Paper Series of the University of Connecticut Human Rights Institute is an effort to gather the most recent work on Economic Rights. This paper is work in progress. The authors remain copyright holders of this paper.

This working paper is indexed on RePEc, <http://repec.org/>

Introduction

Both Nussbaum (1997; 2000; 2003) and Sen (1982; 1999; 2000; 2004; 2005) have written extensively about capabilities and human rights as closely related but distinct concepts that share a common commitment to freedom and justice as central political objectives. Both have emphasized the potential benefits of the complementarities between the two concepts. According to Sen, “A more integrated approach can ... bring significant rewards, and facilitate in practical ways the shared attempts to advance the dignity, well-being and freedom of individuals in general.” (UNDP 2000; p. 19) And in her contribution to this volume, Nussbaum concludes “The two approaches (one being a species of the other²) should march forward as allies in the combat against an exclusive focus on economic growth, and for an approach to development that focuses on people’s real needs and urgent entitlements.”

Much of the literature on this relationship, principally by Nussbaum and Sen, has focused on defining the overlaps and differences between human rights and capabilities as theoretical concepts. Above all, the concept of capabilities helps clarify the theory of human rights as ethical claims that impose positive obligations, and provides a robust defense of economic and social rights.³ But there are many other ways in which human rights and capabilities are complementary⁴. Human rights can be valuable in the field of capabilities as well as the other way round, in clarifying other conceptual issues, and in enriching them as policy frameworks.

² She conceptualizes capabilities as a species of rights.

For example human development and capabilities (HD/C) analysis can benefit from human rights perspectives that focus on locating accountability, attention to the vulnerable and the poorest of the poor, and those who suffer from development processes. Human rights analysis can benefit from the literature on HD/C which investigates the merits of diverse policy options and uses quantitative methods and data.

This paper takes forward the exploration of the relationship between these two concepts and approaches to development by looking at measurement tools for economic and social human rights.

Conceptual framework for human rights measurement – overlaps and differences with human rights and capabilities (HD/C) approach

³ Philosophers have divergent views on the basis of claims to rights (political, legal, or ethical), what claims individuals have right to (social and economic rights?), what correlate obligations they carry (goals or constraints), and whether rights are universally applicable or locally adaptable. The capability approach helps resolve some of these controversies. It provide a clearer framework for entitlements by addressing the unfreedoms that are part of human lives and injustices that individuals face. This perspective contrasts with that of philosophers such as Nozick and Bentham see freedom limited to non-interference, the capabilities framework incorporates positive freedoms and obligations. Sen (1982) has conceptualized rights as ‘goal rights’ which impose correlate obligations that require positive as well as negative action by the duty bearer. In response to those who reject these rights as aspirations because they do not lend themselves to clear identification of whose action caused a person’s rights to be unfulfilled, Sen argues that the correlate obligations can be ‘imperfect’ (2004; Sen in UNDP 2000). See Osmani 2005 and Vizard 2005 for discussion of Sen’s contribution to the field of human rights, particularly in approaching issues of poverty.

⁴ See UNDP 2000 chapter 1, contributed by Sen, for exploration of these complementarities when the two concepts are applied to development analysis and policy.

As normative frameworks for social evaluation, human rights and HD/C overlap significantly in their commitments and priorities. Indicators of human development are frequently used as indicators to measure the extent to which human rights are realized. However, this is erroneous since they are different concepts (UNDP 2000; Green 2001; Raworth 2001). Moreover, there are important differences between these two approaches in both the concept and the way that they have been institutionalized and are used; human rights are institutionalized into law while human development remains an analytical framework. Such differences have considerable implications for the design of assessment approaches and measurement tools.

Overlaps and differences: priorities

In *Women and Human Development*, Nussbaum (2000) explores the unequal social and political conditions in India that restrict women's *capabilities* and limit what lives they can lead. She concludes: 'The outrages suffered every day by millions of women – hunger, domestic violence, child sexual abuse and child marriage, inequality before the law, poverty, lack of dignity and self regard – are not uniformly regarded as scandalous, and the international community has been slow to judge that they are *human rights abuses*' (p.298-299 italics mine). The fundamental concern that motivates both human rights and human development/capability is the freedom and dignity of all individuals (Sen in UNDP 2000), and just social arrangements (Nussbaum forthcoming). Both concepts are concerned with human life a whole, incorporating multiple dimensions, an approach which contrasts with other frameworks, notably utilitarianism, which uses reductionism to narrow the scope of analysis to a single dimension. The terrain of human

rights and capabilities overlap; Nussbaum's list of ten central capabilities reflects the core human rights recognized in international law (Nussbaum 1997; forthcoming)⁵.

Human rights, as entitlements a person has by virtue of being human, could be thought of as claims to essential capabilities. Both rights and capabilities are entitlements that impose correlate obligations of the state that should be reflected in both legislation and other aspects of government policy. In development policy, these two perspectives both emphasize priority attention to inequality, poverty, meeting basic needs, participative process and democratic accountability as core development issues. These agendas are advocated in place of or as a critique of prevailing national and international policies that neglect these issues and tend to give primary attention to economic growth as the over-riding objective. Economists and human rights activists have begun to argue that economic analysis in the HD/C and other heterodox perspectives should be more systematically applied to develop policy instruments for the fulfillment of human rights (Balakrishnan and others 2008; Fukuda-Parr 2008).

However, there are some differences between human rights and HD/C approaches in their literature and strategies related to development, poverty and inequality. HD/C is concerned with development. Human rights literature does not engage with this challenge. It has only recently begun to engage with poverty as a major challenge. In the human rights perspective, equality is an essential aspect of the very notion of human rights as entitlements that are due to individuals

⁵ Sen and Nussbaum differ on the scope of rights and capabilities; Sen (2005) argues that rights are broader than capabilities and include process freedoms that are not capabilities. Nonetheless, the broad range of freedoms is reflected in Sen's five 'instrumental freedoms' (Sen 1999).

by virtue of their being human⁶. As the first line of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights notes: “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.” It is an indispensable element of human rights assessment, and is reflected in critique of policy, such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) for their lack of attention to inequality (OHCHR 2008). The human rights analysis of equality is concerned with discrimination as a violation of right to equality, and investigates disparities based on identities of gender, ethnicity, creed, and race. Inequality does not command the central focus in the HD/C literature and policy agendas where the focus is on progress, and deprivation as well as distribution. The HD/C literature has been concerned with capability as the space in which inequalities should be evaluated. It has contributed to the development economics theory and policy by extending concern with inequality beyond distribution of income. The human rights literature has not engaged with these distinctions, but skirts around them by focusing on discrimination as the essential issue, to be specified in different applied contexts.

Specifying important entitlements and obligations

Individuals have a large number of capabilities, and the potential is infinite. Not all freedoms are equally important. Some can be trivial, and some can be harmful to the individual or to others. So which capabilities should be adopted as important social goals? What are the minimum capabilities that are necessary for a minimally dignified life that should be guaranteed to all individuals in a society that is just? The edifice of international human rights has been

⁶ Note that not all human rights theory conceives of human rights in this way. Others conceive of it as an artifact of law or of political society.

constructed to deliberate on a list of essential human rights. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights arguably constitutes a comprehensive list of such entitlements that should be a minimum for a just society. A major achievement of the 20th century has been to elaborate on these further in developing an extensive set of human rights instruments in the form of covenants, treaties, declarations, general comments and other documents, and to set up a process for their refinement and implementation.

The field of human rights has developed around codifying obligations in international and domestic law, and setting up formal structures and processes for their implementation. Scholarship and advocacy are directed to influencing these processes. Human rights analysis works to locate accountability for securing essential entitlements. The assessment of human rights would then necessarily focus on the extent to which states are complying with their obligations related to most important entitlements required of a just society.

While obligations are a core concept in human rights, they are also an important element of capabilities; capabilities, like human rights, are ‘urgently important entitlements’ that are ‘not just optional needs’ that can be compromised for some other goal such as economic growth (Nussbaum 2003; forthcoming). Nussbaum explains her motive in developing the capabilities approach as a philosophical framework for thinking about these as important issues of justice and provides a rationale for their redress as a priority political goal (Nussbaum 2000, p. 298-299). She explains ‘the aim of the project as a whole is to provide the philosophical underpinnings for an account of basic constitutional principles that should be respected and implemented by

governments of all nations, as a bare minimum of what respect for human dignity requires'. (p. 5)

However, the literature on what should be essential capabilities stops with a controversy on whether a list should be constructed and by whom. Nussbaum argues that the concept of capabilities cannot be used to advance social justice without specifying what capabilities are so important that they are not negotiable. In proposing her list, she explains "these ten central capabilities are supposed to be general goals that can be further specified by the society in question, as it works on the account of fundamental entitlements it wishes to endorse. But in some form all are part of a minimum account of social justice: a society that does not guarantee these to all its citizens, at some appropriate threshold level, falls short of being a fully just society, whatever its level of opulence" (Nussbaum 2005, p. 42). Sen responds: 'The problem is not with listing important capabilities, but with insisting on one predetermined canonical list of capabilities, chosen by theorists without any general social discussion or public reasoning' (Sen 2005)

The process of legislating international human rights contains much of these elements of general social discussion and public reasoning that Sen refers to. It involves all states, and is increasingly influenced by civil society advocates from across the world. Human rights legislation remains an active site of global negotiations over competing conceptualization of what fundamental claims human beings have on social arrangements nationally and globally. It is surprising that neither Nussbaum nor Sen has seriously considered international human rights instruments as a general list of essential capabilities that is universally applicable. Indeed,

Vizard (2007) argues that political and legal consensus forming procedures of the international human rights regime could provide a pragmatic procedure for specifying a list of essential capabilities – or “human rights based capability sets” - that would command international legitimacy.

Although capabilities can be conceptualized as entitlements, the literature on capabilities does not pursue questions about correlate obligations. The HD/C literature pursues questions about implementing priority goals through economic and social policies and other social arrangements but not through the legal process. These distinct approaches are complementary and pursuing such questions would open up an important new area of research and analysis in HD/C approach. Vizard (2007) argues that a human rights-based capability list would incorporate a specification of associated obligations of national governments, international agencies and other duty bearers. The combination of human rights and capabilities could build a pragmatic framework for international accountability for ending poverty (p. 248).

Assessment frameworks - Information and data requirements

Both human rights and capabilities are complex concepts that pose several difficulties in measurement on which a large literature has developed in both fields⁷. Nonetheless, in the HD/C field, a pragmatic approach has been followed to develop and use measurement tools that

⁷ To start with, capabilities defy inter-personal comparison since what is valued is unique to the individual. See for a summary discussion of measurement issues in capabilities. For review of difficulties in human rights measurement, see UNDP 2000; Barsh 2003; and Welling 2008. There is also a strong resistance to measurement on the part of many human rights scholars and activists. See Alston 2001. It is beyond the scope of this paper to consider the merits of measurement. The paper examines measurement methodologies.

provide useful information adapted to a particular context. Indicators play an essential role in evaluating progress, setting priority goals for social action, developing policies. A tradition of empirical analysis has been developed for evidence-based policy making in this perspective. For example, the Human Development Index (HDI) was devised by Sen and Haq for the particular purpose of evaluating development progress of countries in the context of international and national development policy debates⁸.

Measurement tools and methods of human rights and HD/C overlap in some ways but should differ because they relate to two distinct – though overlapping and complementary – concepts, and are used in different ways. Social evaluation in the human rights perspective is concerned with the extent to which human rights are realized while HD/C is concerned with the expansion of capabilities. Human rights metrics are used in formulating and evaluating economic and social policy in the development context. Human rights metrics are to be used in assessing state performance for their compliance with their obligations in the legal context.

There are overlaps in the information requirements. Human development indicators serve well to reflect the well being of people and the current enjoyment of rights – though they may not be guaranteed. They focus directly on human well-being and indicators of human outcomes, and would include: (i) multiple dimensions of human life – capabilities or rights – each of which has

⁸ Sen argues that capabilities that are of most importance would differ from one individual to another, and from one country to another and can only be identified on the basis of democratic debate by the people themselves, indicators for assessing progress can be selected in a particular context (Sen 2005).

intrinsic importance and is not substitutable; (ii) data showing aggregate average levels of progress and levels of deprivations; (iii) data disaggregated by groups such as by gender, ethnicity, religion, race, and class; (iv) indicators of participation and empowerment. These information requirements common to human rights and HD/C assessments contrast with the conventional approach to social evaluation used in development that focuses on economic indicators, aggregates without deprivation and distributional measures.

However, these indicators are not adequate measures of human rights realization; this entails both the enjoyment of rights as well as the extent to which the rights are guaranteed by state action. Human rights assessment is concerned with whether state conduct is in compliance with the norms and standards of international human rights law⁹. While obligations are specific to each particular right, the international law identifies common elements of obligations across all economic and social rights are delineated. First, they include three types of behavior: *to respect rights* (not directly violating a person's rights); *to protect rights* (acting to refrain others from violating a person's rights); and *to fulfill rights* (acting to facilitate the realization of rights). Second, the obligations apply to both "*result*" (extent to which people are enjoying the right) and "*conduct*" (taking action aimed at realization of a right). The actions refer to a range of measures that would create a facilitating environment for the realization of rights, or to provide for them directly. Third, recognizing the limitations of financial and other means

⁹ Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR) General comment 3, The Nature of States Parties' Obligations (CESCR 1990); The Maastricht Guidelines on Violations of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (UN 2000)

necessary for the fulfillment of rights and the diverse initial conditions from which human rights conditions are evaluated, states are not required to achieve full realization of rights overnight, but “progressively”. According to Article 2.1 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) “Each State Party to the present Covenant undertakes to take steps, individually and through international assistance and cooperation, especially economic and technical, to the maximum of its available resources, with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of the rights recognized in the present Covenant by all appropriate means...” (UN 1966) However, states cannot wait to make effort, but take steps “as expeditiously as possible” towards full realization, immediately end discrimination, and must not allow “retrogression”. Moreover, states have a “minimum core obligation” to achieve a minimum level of rights with immediate effect. Fourth, international law also specifically calls on states to remove discrimination as an immediate obligation. Fifth, important obligations relate to the procedural or cross-cutting norms of non-discrimination, participation and accountability.

Human development indicators do not provide information on the extent to which a state is complying with its obligations.

Human rights measurement strategies – the use of economic and social science data and methods

This section turns to the possible use of data and tools of HD/C approach in human rights assessments. The methodology of human rights analysis has been dominated by case study

analysis that emphasizes contextual specificity and uses qualitative information. It has made very limited use of quantitative analysis, country aggregation, and cross-country comparisons¹⁰. Moreover the conceptual and empirical knowledge of development economics have not been used in human rights analysis. The early literature on human rights measurement assumed that socio-economic indicators of outcome variables were adequate reflections of rights fulfillment, ignoring obligations of progressive realization¹¹. While the recent literature on measurement in the last decade clarified the difference, these outcome measures continue to dominate assessments and advocacy. Measurement tools developed for civil and political rights were based on reports focused on cases of gross violations. These reflect failures to respect, but not to protect and fulfill human rights, nor the concept of progressive realization. Thus these approaches are effective in locating accountability in specific cases, and in generating qualitative information but have limitations for making assessment of the overall conduct of the state or the overall realization of rights in the following ways:

- Obligations - Focus on outcomes reflect enjoyment of rights in the right holder perspective and neglects obligations in the duty bearer perspective;
- Positive duties - Obligations to protect and fulfill rights that require positive actions rather than merely refraining from acting to respect;

¹⁰ See Alston (2000) for a brief summary of the objections to these methods, and Carr Center (2006) for the views of leading international human rights NGOs and scholars.

¹¹ See for example . The limitations of focusing on rights enjoyment only is well developed in UNDP (2000); Green (2002); and Raworth (2002).

- Aggregation to the national level - Qualitative case studies cannot be aggregated to reflect on the behavior of the state as a whole with respect to its entire population rather than to specific individuals or groups;
- Quantification - without quantitative information, it is not possible to determine whether compliance is improving or deteriorating, how widespread abuses and suffering might be and the magnitude of populations affected, and empirically analyze which groups might be particularly affected;
- Progressive realization – progressive realization is a core concept of economic and social rights but has long been controversial; it could provide as an ‘escape hatch’ to states who could always argue that they could not make more effort to improve human rights enjoyment amongst the population. Just how much progress should be achieved in a given time and just how much effort should be made? The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights have adopted a procedure of setting ‘benchmarks’ against which performance would be assessed. But this leaves the problem of setting the benchmark. Without evidence based information and theoretical approach to setting objective standards for setting benchmarks required to be met by the duty bearer, standards for what level of realization can be expected is left to subjective judgement;
- Cross-country comparison – because the international system for monitoring human rights is a system of peer review amongst states, cross-country comparison is taboo. It has also been eschewed by many human rights activists who argue that human rights compliance is country specific and defies such comparisons. However, without cross country comparisons, it is difficult to objectively assess what might be a reasonable

achievement in rights realization that could be achieved in a given context of economic, social and political realities.

For these reasons, the 2009 *Report of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights on Implementation of Economic, Social and Cultural rights* concludes that it is “important to develop tools to assess the appropriateness of the measures adopted by the State to implement rights, as well as the achieved results. Monitoring realization requires tools that are capable of measuring results and progress over time” (UN 2009, para. 34). The potential value of using quantitative data in human rights analysis has long been recognized. The first UN Special Rapporteur for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ESCRs) took up this issue as his main area of work and noted in his 1990 report: ‘Indeed, without the availability of a measurement device based on some form of statistical data, there is little chance of obtaining an overall picture which shows the extent which these rights are realized. Indicators can provide one means of assessing progress over time towards the ‘progressive realization’ of these norms’ (Turk 1990 para 7). That report stimulated many academics, human rights advocates and UN agencies to work on measurement . A significant literature on measurement of human rights emerged addressing numerous conceptual aspects of the challenge and proposed ways of approaching measurement. Much of the initial work concluded that lack of specificity in the substantive contents of rights was a major obstacle to the development of indicators¹². The difficulty of setting standards in the context of ‘progressive realization’ emerged as another challenge. For example, Chapman (1998) proposed the ‘violations approach’ given the impossibility of tackling obligations of

12 See Welling 2009 for a good review of this literature.

progressive fulfillment subject to maximum available resources. Alston (2000) proposed an approach, in a paper published in this Journal, to developing an index of 'human rights accountability' based on how well states were reporting on their compliance that skirts around these problems by focusing on reporting. Hunt (2003) proposed a procedural approach to using indicators and setting benchmark targets for progressive realization within the human rights machinery. He also proposed a way of organizing indicators in three categories: outcome, structure and process that differentiate between obligations of result and conduct. The Centre for Economic and Social Rights (CESR) proposed the multiple ways in which human development indicators could be used in human rights analyses but does not address progressive realization (Felner 2009).

Moving beyond conceptual debates and general approaches, a number of initiatives emerged to develop indicator sets and measurement tools to be used in analyses of human rights situations across different countries of the world. Among the most widely discussed initiative are: (i) the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights framework and illustrative indicators (2004, 2006, 2008); (ii) Right to Health indicators by Hunt and others (Backman and others 2009); (iii) Indicators Benchmarking Scoping Assessment (IBSA) initiative indicators for the right to food and right to water by University of Mannheim and FIAN International (Riedel 2006); (iv) Education project proposals for right to education developed by Action Aid in collaboration with NGOs (Right to Education Project 2010) and academics (Kalantry 2010); (v) proposals for right to water by the NGO COHRE (2010); (vi) Organization of American States (OAS) guidelines on indicators; and (vii) Economic and Social Rights Fulfillment Index (ESRF-Index) proposed by Fukuda-Parr, Lawson-Remer and Randolph (2009; 2010).

How do these approaches overcome the limitations of existing, case based methodologies?

Obligations – all of these initiatives contain the duty bearer perspective rather than focus exclusively on the rights bearer enjoyment of rights. The initiatives from OHCHR, Hunt, IBSA, and OAS categorize indicators by outcome, structure and process which separate the rights bearer perspective under outcome and duty bearer perspective under process, with structure reflecting both perspectives. The initiatives of NGOs for education (Right to Education Project 2010) and water (Roaf 2005) organize indicators by substantive content of rights: accessibility, adaptability, acceptability, and availability for education, and availability, physical accessibility, quality, affordability for housing. This way of categorizing features of rights has been important in structuring obligations for many other rights. The ESRF Index captures obligations by focusing on resource constraints. Apart from the ESRF Index, these initiatives all aim to develop detailed lists of obligations specific to particular rights. They have adopted the framework of outcome-structure-process in identifying indicators. They produce long lists of obligations; in the case of Hunt's proposal for health, this numbers 72 (of which only 29 are numerical) indicators and in the case of the education initiative by Action Aid, over 200 indicators.

Positive duties – all these initiatives focus on positive duties to fulfill rights.

Aggregation to the national level – all these initiatives focus on the country as the unit of analysis rather than on specific individuals. Most make efforts to focus on sub-groups within the country. However there is no aggregation across rights, with the exception of the ESRF Index which is a composite of six core economic and social rights.

Quantification – the initiatives except for the ESRF Index propose indicators that include both non-quantitative and quantitative information, including conventional socio-economic data. For example, CORE proposes the percentage of local authority water and sanitation budgets that is allocated to marginalized and vulnerable groups, as an indicator of equity in budget allocations (p. 26). But there is a preponderance of ‘indicators’ that are not quantitative and are expressed as questions with yes/no answers. For example, “are specific national and local budgetary strategies in place to address the needs of marginalized and vulnerable groups?” (p. 26).

Progressive realization – the ESRF Index tackles the concept of progressive realization head on and proposes an objective, evidence-based methodology for setting benchmarks based on empirical data. By using the data and methodology of development economics, the Index turns the abstract concept of progressively achieving higher levels of fulfillment as state capacity expands, to an empirically based model of what can realistically be achieved on the basis of historical experience worldwide. All the other proposals provide qualitative and quantitative information on state behavior and rights enjoyment, but do not offer a method for setting benchmarks on an objective basis.

Cross-country comparison – all the proposed methods take a global perspective and potentially make inter-country comparison possible. But such comparisons are of limited value in assessing obligations that are for progressive realization because state capacity is not incorporated in the indicators. Only the ESRF Index does this as explained.

Overall, these recent proposals present an important advance over the traditional human rights methodology based on cases. They incorporate the duty bearer perspective and focus on

obligations. They take a global perspective and focus on the country – rather than an individual case – as the unit of analysis. Most build on clarifying the core features of substantive rights and developing indicators related to state obligations, but stop at addressing ‘progressive realization’. The ESRF Index, however, takes the literature forward in that direction, towards an empirical, evidence-based approach to setting benchmarks against which progressive realization can be evaluated.

Economic and Social Rights Fulfillment Index (ESRF Index)

The conceptual framework and the calculation methodology for the ECRF Index are fully elaborated in two articles published in the *Journal of Human Rights*, one on concepts (Fukuda-Parr and others 2009) and one on the first round of country scores and rankings (Randolph and others 2010). The index is a composite measure of economic and social rights that incorporates six core rights (rights to health, education, food, housing, social security, decent work), and uses socio-economic survey data from international series with comparable cross-country data and time trends.

The index integrate obligations of result and obligations of conduct. The socio-economic data are used as indicators of result, the degree to which the people of the country are enjoying their rights in concrete, substantive terms. Then focusing on the obligations of progressive realization, the index adjusts these outcomes with a measure of state capacity, using GDP. The adjustment is made to reflect how far the country has moved to achieving a benchmark which is defined as the highest possible level of achievement given the level of resources available. Note that this is not

government expenditures but resources available to the state. Note also that it makes no effort to identify specific policy measures to achieve fulfillment, quite intentionally on the grounds that policy measures necessary to secure human rights enjoyment varies from one country to another. It builds specifically on the position that there is no 'one size fits all' set of policies that would lead to people enjoying their rights, say for example, the right to primary schooling. In some countries, this may be extra government expenditure to build schools. In others, it may be improving school management. In yet others, the safety on the roads that girls must travel on to reach the school may be the most important means to securing the right to schooling.

Using a methodology termed 'achievement possibilities frontier' (APF), this index estimates the potential enjoyment level for each core right at a given level of state capacity, measured by GDP per capita. The first step is to look at the historic record of achievement levels of all countries of the world for 25 years. These achievement data are then plotted against GDP per capita in PPP values. A 'frontier' is then drawn, using the highest levels of achievement observed for different levels of GDP. Another way of conceptualizing the APF is that it is a rigorous methodology for setting benchmarks for the obligations of progressive realization for each country.

This procedure is illustrated in Figure I which shows the scatter-plots for two indicators: low height for age, an indicator of malnutrition and the right to food; and income/consumption below the poverty threshold of \$1.25, used as an indicator of the right to work that is productive, one of the elements of the right to decent work. The first scatter-plot charts the percentage that is not low height for age (or not malnourished) against GDP per capita. The second scatter-plot charts the percentage of non-poor against GDP per capita. The line at the top shows the achievement

production possibilities frontier. The frontier values can be a basis for setting the benchmark of progressive realization at different levels of income; states should be obligated to achieve the highest level historically recorded for countries with the the same level of resources that they currently have. The distance between the current achievement levels of a country against the benchmark, defined by the frontier, represents the extent to which the obligations of progressive realization fall short. All countries should be at the frontier if they were making the best effort to achieve rights fulfillment given the resources that are available. The scatter-plots give interesting insights into the nature of progressive realization. They show wide dispersion among countries at the same level of income, and that in most cases, the frontier flattens out at a relatively low level of income. These patterns empirically demonstrate the relationship between income and rights enjoyment. Further investigations of these relationship can contribute to clarifying the concepts of progressive realization and maximum available resources that have been problematic in the literature of economic and social rights.

The ESRF provides sub-scores for each of the core rights, and the aggregate score across the rights is the combined composite score for economic and social rights as a whole. It provides a rigorous and evidence-based tool for monitoring state compliance than outcome indicators evaluated against benchmarks.

Conclusions

Philip Alston, a leading authority on economic and social rights, noted in a 2001 article in the *Journal of Human Development*: “The international human rights regime is one of the most

important positive legacies to emerge from the twentieth century. The principle of accountability is one of its indispensable characteristics. It is not surprising, then, that the greatest challenge confronting the international community in this domain at the beginning of the twenty-first century is to develop approaches that give substance and meaning to that principle. New initiatives are required at both the national and international levels.”

In responding to this challenge, the methods and concepts used in HD/C approach, drawing on economics and social science traditions can be an important resource. The ESRF Index complements the other innovations in assessment tools that are emerging in the human rights field. While most of the new measurement approaches being proposed focus on refining the substantive features of rights and obligations and offer sets of numerous indicators, the ESRF Index methodology is an aggregative summary measure which gives an overall assessment of state performance. Both are useful in locating accountability. The ESRF uses quantitative methods and concepts of economics (production possibilities frontier) and of human development (non-automatic relationship between resources and human outcomes) to develop an empirical basis for modeling progressive realization as a norm. It brings the tradition of evidence-based policy making into the challenge of developing objective benchmarks for progressive realization in human rights assessments.

As approaches to development, human rights and HD/C approaches share the same key objectives of expanding human freedoms and dignity, and concern with fundamental entitlements of people. But the two concepts have distinct methods and concepts of analysis, and the methodologies of one can enrich the other. Quantitative methods of HD/C can enrich the

efforts to develop a metric of human rights. The scope for applying such HD/C methods in human rights analysis extends well beyond this particular case.

References

- Alston, Philip (2000), Towards a Human Rights Accountability Index, *Journal of Human Rights*, 1:2 pp 249-271**
- Balakrishnan, R. and D. Elson (2008) Auditing Economic Policy in the Light of Obligations on Economic and Social Rights, *Essex Human Rights Review*, 1 5:1 pp.29-49.**
- Chapman, Audrey (1996) A Violations Approach for Monitoring the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights” *Human Rights Quarterly*, 18:1, pp 23-66.
- Committee on Economic Social and Cultural Rights 1990 General Comment 3: The Nature of States Parties’ Obligations, United Nations, Economic and Social Council, Fifth Session, December 14.
- Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (2009) General Comment 20: Non-Discrimination in Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, United Nations Economic and Social Council, 42nd session, 4-22 May 2009, U.N. Doc. E/C.12/GC/20, 10 June.
- Fukuda-Parr, Sakiko (2003) The Human Development Paradigm, Operationalizing Sen’s Ideas on Capabilities, *Feminist Economics*, 9:2-3, pp.301-317
- Fukuda-Parr, S. (2008) Human Rights and Development, in Kaushik Basu and Ravi Kanbur (eds.), *Arguments for a Better World*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fukuda-Parr, Sakiko, Terra Lawson-Remer and Susan Randolph. (2009) An Index of Economic and Social Rights Fulfillment: Concept and Methodology, *Journal of Human Rights*, 8:3, pp195-221
- Green, Maria (2001) What We Talk About When We Talk About Indicators: Current Approaches to Human Rights Measurement, *Human Rights Quarterly* 23 pp 1062-1097
- Hunt, Paul (2003) The right of everyone to enjoy the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, report of Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights, United Nations, General Assembly A/58/427, 10 October 2003
- Kalantry, Sital, Jocelyn E. Getgen and Steven Arrigg Koh (2010) Enhancing Enforcement of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: A Focus on the Right to Education in the ICESCR, *Human Rights Quarterly*, 32.2, pp. 253-310
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1997) Capabilities and Human Rights, *Fordham Law Review*, 66, pp 273-300.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2000) *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2003) Capabilities as Fundamental Entitlements, *Feminist Economics*, 9:2-3, pp 33-59.

Nussbaum, M.C. (forthcoming) Capabilities, Entitlements, Rights:

Supplementation and Critique, *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*

Organization of American States, Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (2008) Guidelines for preparation of progress indicators in the area of economic, social and cultural rights, Organization of American States OEA/Ser.L/V/II.132 Doc 14, 19 July 2008

OHCHR (2004) *Human Rights and Poverty Reduction: A Conceptual Framework* (New York and Geneva, United Nations, 2004),
<http://www.ohchr.org/english/issues/poverty/docs/povertyE.pdf>. accessed 5.9.2010

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (2008) Claiming the Millennium Development Goals: A human rights approach, United Nations, New York and Geneva
http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/Claiming_MDGs_en.pdf accessed 5.9.2010

Osmani, Siddiqur (2000) Human Rights to Food, Health and Education, *Journal of Human Development* 1:2, pp. 273-298

Osmani, Siddiqur (2005) Poverty and Human Rights: Building on the Capabilities Approach, *Journal of Human Development*, 6:2

Randolph, Susan, Sakiko Fukuda-Parr, and Terra Lawson-Remer (2010) Economic and Social Rights Fulfilment Index: Country Scores and Rankings, *Journal of Human Rights*,9:3, pp 230-261

Raworth, Kate (2001) Measuring Human Rights, *Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs*, *Ethics in International Affairs*, 15:1

Riedel, Eibe (2006) The IBSA Procedure as a Tool of Human Rights Monitoring, last viewed September 17, 2010, <<http://ibsa.uni-mannheim.de/2 - The IBSA-Procedure as a Tool of Human Rights Monitoring 1 .pdf>>

Right to Education Project (2010), The Indicator Tree, <http://www.right-to-education.org/node/948> accessed 11.1.2010

Roaf, Virginia, Ashfaq Khalfan and Malcolm Langford (2005), “Monitoring Implementation of the right to Water: A Framework for Developing Indicators” Global Issues Papers, No. 14, accessed 9.17, 2009, <<http://www.canadians.org/water/documents/righttowaterindicators.pdf>>.,

Sen, Amartya (1982) Rights and Agency, *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 11:1: 3-39.

Sen, Amartya. (1999). *Development as Freedom*. Alfred Knopf Publishers, New York.

Sen, Amartya (2004) Elements of a Theory of Human Right, *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 23 (4), pp. 315-356

Sen, Amartya (2000) Human Rights and Human Development Chapter 1 of UNDP, *Human Development Report 2000: Human Rights and Human Development*, Oxford University Press, Oxford

Sen, Amartya (2005) 'Human Rights and Capabilities', *Journal of Human Development*, 6:2, pp. 151-66.

Turk, Danilo (1990) Realization of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Progress report prepared by Mr. Danilo Turk, Special Rapporteur E/CN.4/Sub.2/1990/19 United Nations, Economic and Social Council, Commission on Human Rights.

United Nations. (1987) The Limburg Principles on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Guidelines adopted at a workshop sponsored by the International Commission of Jurists, the Faculty of Law of the University of Limburg, and the Urban Morgan Institute for Human Rights, University of Cincinnati, Maastricht, Netherlands, 22-26 January 1997, UN doc. E/CN.4/1987/17.

United Nations (2000) The Maastricht Guidelines on Violations of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Guidelines adopted at a workshop sponsored by the International Commission of Jurists, the Urban Morgan Institute for Human Rights and the Center for Human Rights of the Faculty of Law of Maastricht University, Maastricht, Netherlands, 22-26 January, 1997. UN doc. E/C.12/2000/13.

United Nations Development Programme (2000) *Human Development Report 2000: Human Development and Human Rights*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

United Nations International Human Rights Instruments (2008) Report on Indicators for Promoting and Monitoring the Implementation of Human Rights (HRI/MC/2008/3) 6 June 2008

United Nations International Human Rights Instruments (2006) Report on Indicators for Monitoring Compliance with International Human Rights Instruments (HRI/MC/2006/7)

United Nations, Economic and Social Council (2009) Report of the High Commissioner for Human Rights on implementation of economic, social and cultural rights E/2009/90, 8 June 2009

Vizard, Polly (2005) The Contributions of Professor Amartya Sen in the Field of Human Rights, LSE STICERD Research Paper No. CASE 091

<http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/dps/case/cp/CASEpaper91.pdf> accessed 5.9.2010

Vizard, Polly (2006) *Poverty and Human Rights: Sen's Capability Perspective Explored*, Oxford University Press, New York

Vizard, Polly (2007), Specifying and Justifying a Basic Capability Set: Should the International Human Rights Framework be given a more Direct Role? *Oxford Development Studies* 35:3 pp. 225-229

Welling, 2009 International Indicators and Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, *Human Rights Quarterly*, 30, pp 933-958