What measures can be taken to ensure that development cooperation does not risk violating human rights? What safeguards can be put in place?    
Safeguards, in the world we live where donors often pursue their geopolitical interests, there are none. **Only a mobilization of public interest civil societies in donor countries can amass the pressure needed to make ODA HR responsive** and not, knowingly or by default HR-violating.

Only **Sweden has a parliamentary legal obligation to address HR in their ODA**. HRIAs, as in the next question will help.   
¬   
What role is there for human rights impact assessments in development cooperation programmes?   
**Indeed an important role**. But the methodologies are still being worked out. The **Special Rapporteur should advocate firmly for such to be made available in the WATSAN** domain.   
¬   
What measures can be used to ensure that human rights obligations are followed in the process of determining priorities and deciding which countries and programmes will receive financial and other support?   
In donor countries:

**Both HR experts and representatives of civil society must be involved in such decision making**.

**ODA staff is too often not HR trained**.

In recipient countries:

First of all, **countries must have mechanisms in place to coordinate** donor programs and projects and **have a final say on what will be accepted**, what contents each aid package will have and where it will be directed-to both geographically in the country and which programs in each selected area. **So far, donors mostly do what they please and countries passively receive that aid**. (It must be noted that HR principles require helping the most vulnerable, regardless of where they are).

Second, this mechanism/entity has to have **participation of representatives of public interest civil society and social movements** **with voice and vote**.

Third, **local communities to receive the aid must be briefed before launch**, have a final say, and then get involved in the implementation and monitoring. Only thus will the **ownership** be there to eventually promise some success.   
¬   
What measures can be used to ensure that human rights obligations are followed in the process of designing programmes and projects?   
There is a horrendous deficit in HR Learning. **An active campaign to provide HR Learning learning for donors and recipients is a must**: Now, before anything else (not 'can be used' as the question insinuates). The ignorance of what claim holders and duty bearers are all about is supine; not to talk about their respective prerogatives, roles and obligations. **Donors should virtually stop any new ODA and concentrate on such HR Learning at a quite massive scale**. Much of what is needed then, to get HR obligations incorporated, should come easier. Let me add that it is not only recipients in the bureaucracy that need this learning. It **is also, to begin with, leaders of local public interest civil society and social movements**. Ideally, they should receive the training together with the government officers to start a claim holder/duty bearer dialogue right from then on.   
¬   
What measures can be used to ensure that development cooperation promotes equality and tackles discrimination?   
These are only sub-themes directly linked to the introduction of a HR-based planning process that will be covered in ongoing HR Learning seminars. Note that there are **no measures to 'ensure' this promotion other than claim holders fiercely demanding** this in their mobilization for HR. I note that we are not here talking of equality of access, but equality of outcomes! ...a big difference especially in the WATSAN area.   
 ¬   
What mechanisms can be used to ensure that development cooperation promotes transparency and access to information?   
Again, **nothing can 'ensure'**... The role here again primarily is for public interest CSOs in the donor countries. They are the ones to demand transparency. An example is the pledge donors make for assorted world crises which are finally not new money, but a chunk of the foreign aid bill they already have in their budgets and that is skillfully reallocated. On the recipient side, plenty needs to be done on this as well. Key is the role claim holders have to play in demanding this info and transparency hence the need for their empowerment. Participatory budgeting is an option not to be overlooked.  
  
What measures can be used to ensure that development cooperation programmes and projects are based on participatory processes?   
Participation is not something that can be achieved through 'ensuring measures' benevolently taken from above. Much less in development cooperation. Active participation is the logical outcome of the empowerment process that claim holders have to (and are) undergo(ing). They will demand participation. Period. Anything the Rapporteur can do to channel these WATSAN claim holder empowering processes will be his lasting legacy.   
¬   
What monitoring mechanisms can be put in place to assess development cooperation programmes and projects with respect to human rights obligations?   
Ultimately only bottom-centered monitoring mechanisms will be able to hold pertinent duty bearers accountable. This brings us right back to what has been said above about empowering claim holders. Monitoring and accountability of duty bearer actions are an important part of claim holder empowerment. There are now available tools for HR-based monitoring. They may have to be adapted/adopted for WATSAN and should be covered in HR Learning sessions.   
¬   
What accountability mechanisms can be put in place so that people affected by development cooperation programmes or projects can effectively have complaints addressed?   
I see accountability as much more than having affected people's complaints addressed. It is a process whose end purpose is for claim holders to forcefully demand changes by effectively exerting a counter-power. It is not about 'please stop abusing HR' or tinkering with smaller irritating outcomes of bad policies or unacceptable corporate behavior. This all blends-in with the empowerment of claim holders needed; it comes up in almost all the questions here. Last but not least, it is not us who are called upon to 'put in place' these mechanisms!   
¬   
What measures can be taken to ensure the sustainability of development cooperation in line with human rights principles?   
Let's put it another way: development cooperation not applying HR principles and standards has resulted in literally billions of ODA dollars having been miserably squandered over the last 60 years --this actually being part of the non-sustainability problem rather than having picked the right solutions.   ....and we have not learned from this. Am I saying that top-down measures to secure HR principles are incorporated in ODA will make ODA sustainable? Absolutely not! You guessed: sustainability comes from below, from participation and ownership  ....and we have not learned from this either beyond lip service. Ask claim holders, whose WATSAN rights are being violated day-in-day-out, what measures need to be taken for a (way remote) chance of ODA's sustainability and for it to become a reality under the current development paradigm --or actually, for that matter, ask them all the above questions. That could be a beginning.   
As much as we may hate it, 'we development workers' are more in the search for prescriptive measures in a duty bearers' role than in claim holders' shoes. ...and we keep prescribing.   
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