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1. Background and Overview of the Program

Since 2004, the Diplomacy Training Program (DTP) has organised annual regional training programs for Indigenous Peoples’ advocates in the Asia Pacific region. These programs have been developed in response to concerns and issues impacting on Indigenous Peoples across the region. While there is much regional diversity, many vulnerable groups share concerns about forced evictions, loss of livelihoods and violence associated with the impact of rapid economic development. The benefits of development often elude the groups most in need of access to services essential for ensuring their human rights. In recent years there has been an increasing interest in participating in these regional training programs from groups in Myanmar.

As is the case elsewhere in the region, significant environmental and social threats, as well as the inequitable distribution of the benefits of development, are issues that resonate for many ethnic groups in post 2010 Myanmar. The transition from military rule to political liberalisation, which is seeing significant reform and an influx of new international businesses and finance, is also accompanied by the loss of access to land and livelihoods for many groups, notably those living in resource rich special economic zones (SEZ) or in the path of energy pipelines. Displaced by mining, logging and natural gas projects the number of internally displaced people has been growing, exacerbating ethnic and religious tensions, threatening the progress of political reform and entrenching the impoverishment of affected communities.

It was in response to these concerns, and with the encouragement of some of DTP’s alumni in Myanmar, that DTP organized its 2014 Indigenous Regional program in Yangon. To be inclusive of all ethnic nationalities in Myanmar and acknowledging the role of the private sector as the primary focus in many of the shared concerns of Indigenous peoples in the region, this program was titled Human Rights in Advocacy for Development and Business.

Twenty-five participants from different countries in the region completed the 10-day intensive training programs. Fourteen of the participants came from a number of states throughout Myanmar and they were joined by community advocates from Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Nepal and Pakistan.

The program provided participants with comprehensive and practical knowledge of international human rights standards and the mechanisms that can be used to protect and promote human rights. Participants were given opportunities to develop and practice their skills in strategic advocacy, campaigning and lobbying, and engaging the media effectively. Through the program’s participatory approach, involving group work, role-plays, forum theatre, facilitated discussions and individual presentations, the participants explored the practical application to their own communities and contexts of the principles, concepts, methods and mechanisms introduced by the team of expert trainers.

As reflected in the final participant evaluations, the training program successfully met the expectations of participants for new and valuable knowledge and skills. This report provides an analysis of these evaluations, a description of the program and includes some recommendations and reflections for next steps.

DTP expresses its deep appreciation to the trainers who shared their knowledge and expertise on the program. Professor Virginia Dandan, (UN Independent Expert on Human Rights and International Solidarity), Serena Lillywhite (Mining Advocacy Coordinator at Oxfam Australia), Professor Paul Redmond, (Inaugural Sir Gerald Brennan Research Professor at University of Technology Sydney and
Emeritus Professor of Law at the University of New South Wales), Joshua Cooper (Academic in Human Rights Law, University of Hawaii and the International Training Centre for Teaching Peace and Human Rights in Geneva), Debbie Stothard, (Secretary General of the International Federation for Human Rights and Coordinator of the Alternative ASEAN Network on Burma ) and Bobbie Sta Maria, (Southeast Asia Researcher & Representative for the Business & Human Rights Resource Centre). A number of leading community advocates from Myanmar, including Khin Ma Ma Myo, Khon Ja and Kyaw Thu, Ye Lin Myint, Bo Bo Aung and Wai Wai Lwin provided local expertise and experience.

*Human Rights in Advocacy for Development and Business* was organized in partnership with *Equality Myanmar and Foundation for Education and Development*. The program was made possible through financial assistance from the *Scully Foundation, Oxfam Australia* and the Norwegian Centre for Human Rights. DTP would like to thank these organisations and the trainers for their support.

### 2. Purposes of the Program:

- To enhance the capacity of civil society advocates and their organizations to engage in effective advocacy to protect and promote their rights in their societies.
- To enable Indigenous peoples’ advocates and their organizations to promote and use the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and other human rights agreements as a standard to guide good government policy and practice.
- To build the skills of advocates to participate and engage effectively with government and private sector to build better governance and sustainable and participatory development.
- To enhance skills that allow for the creation of economic growth through co-operation with business and the local community.
- To enable participants to promote and exercise their rights to free, prior and informed consent both in relation to government and the private sector.
- To build the knowledge and skills of ethnic nationality and Indigenous peoples’ advocates and their organizations to use the UN’s Treaty Bodies, Special Procedures and Universal Periodic Review process to achieve practical change in their societies.
- To enable the exchange of experience and good practice between countries in the region in relation to recognition of Indigenous rights, shared land use and management, traditional knowledge, and corporate social responsibility/accountability.
- To strengthen regional networks and grassroots and national level organizations to work effectively to defend and promote their human rights in the context of the challenges of rapid economic development.

### 3. Location

The choice of location for this program was influenced by advice from DTP’s alumni and partners. It was hoped that holding the program in Myanmar would make a positive contribution to the work of local organisations and advocates responding to the challenges and opportunities accompanying the rapid change currently being experienced in the country.

### 4. Participants

There was an open call for participants, distributed through DTP’s alumni networks and partner organisations and through NGO networks. Selections were made in consultation with DTP partners in
the region including Equality Myanmar and Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP). Regrettably, DTP was not able to secure the funding to enable all of the selected participants to attend the program. Two successful applicants from Bangladesh, despite persistent efforts, were not able to secure a visa. A complete list of participant’s biographies is included in Appendix 1.

5. **Program Methodology and Materials**

The DTP’s training approach is based on the understanding that individuals working together have the power to effect change in their societies. The program methodology reflects a deep respect for the knowledge, experiences and perspectives that participants bring to the program. The program balances development of knowledge and skills in an integrated way, and a teaching methodology that fosters interaction and participation. DTP places emphasis on the practical application of knowledge on human rights and advocacy skills, and encourages trainers to use participatory training methods such as role-plays and exercises wherever possible and encourages participants to share their own experiences.

DTP seeks to include real life advocacy exercises in its programs to enhance learning and build skills and confidence. Other activities such as welcome and closing dinners, solidarity and cultural nights are also designed to encourage collaboration and networking among participants in a less formal setting. Building networks and solidarity, and bonds of long-lasting friendship are encouraged outside the formal structure of the program.

At the start of the program participants are divided into groups to help manage the program. This facilitates participant ownership of the program, provides opportunity for public speaking and program management skills and generates on-going monitoring of the training. Participants are also encouraged to keep a daily diary for their own purposes.

Each participant is asked to make a presentation during the program. These presentations are an important component of the training enabling all participants, including DPT staff and trainers, to build knowledge and understanding of the human rights issues in different countries and communities and in the region more broadly. The presentations provide a further opportunity for building skills in presenting information and messages clearly and concisely.

Participants are given an extensive manual consisting of a number of short chapters on the topics covered, written by experts in the field. The manual was designed to be a practical tool during the training and participants are encouraged to read relevant chapters prior to particular sessions. It is also designed to be a reference tool for participants in their work after the training. An electronic copy of materials for distribution to participants at the end of the training is also produced compiling all materials and output developed in the program.

6. **Description of the Program**

**Day 1:**
**Opening Ceremony, Introductions and Overview**

The program was formally opened with welcome remarks from Aung Myo Min, the Executive Director of Equality Myanmar, DTP’s Executive Director, Patrick Earle and Professor Virginia Dandan, UN Independent Expert on Human Rights and International Solidarity.
**Myanmar - Post Democracy Developments and Challenges. Panel**

In the first formal session Wai Hnin Po, from Foundation for Education and Development, facilitated a panel discussion with three of Myanmar’s leading community advocates – Khin Ma Ma Myo, Khon Ja and Kyaw Thu. Khin Ma Ma Myo, Founder and Executive Director of the Myanmar Institute of Peace and Security Studies, provided the participants with an overview on the current political situation and the role of military. Based on her comprehensive comparison of stable civil/political relations in democracies with the current situation in Myanmar, Khin Ma Ma Myo suggested that political liberalisation, rather than democracy, is a more accurate term for the current developments in the Myanmar political system. Khon Ja, Coordinator of the Kachin Peace Network, demonstrated with slides from the Peace Monitoring Dashboards, the extent of remaining conflict in Kachin State. Some ethnic groups, including ceasefire groups, whose borders overlap with contracted investment sites or whose lands lie in the path of military expansion, are still facing ongoing violence. Kyaw Thu detailed some of the threats facing civil society, including increasing reports of journalists being arrested for taking the news, the current land laws favouring the interests of investors, intercultural strife and a legal environment which, despite reform, has not really improved for civil society. Kyaw Thu acknowledged the history and resilience of civil society in Myanmar.

**An introduction to human rights principles, values and standards: The Universal Declaration of Human Rights & Identifying human rights issues – interactive session**

- Professor Virginia Dandan.

Professor Virginia Dandан introduced her sessions by inviting participant’s to share their ideas and perspectives on advocacy. Noting the centrality of change and transformation, Virginia reminded participants that as advocates they need to be sure that what they are asking for will lead to the betterment of people’s lives and not to anything detrimental.

Virginia introduced the Universal Declaration on Human Rights (UDHRs) and the International Bill of Rights – the building blocks for a framework of human rights standards developed since 1948. She explained the principles/standards that are enshrined in the UDHR:

- Equality and Non Discrimination;
- Inclusion and Participation;
- Accountability and Transparency;
- Attention to Vulnerable Groups;
- Rule of Law

Then, in the first practical session of the program she asked participants to share in groups the specific issues impacting on their communities which relate to the human rights principles enshrined in the UDHR.

**Some examples from this session included:**

Hydropower: the impact on food production (especially rice) for people downstream from the dams and on groups (mainly Indigenous peoples) affected by flooding upstream from the dams who are denied their right to practice their culture and religion when they have to relocate – away from the places sacred to them - all the principles/ standards of human rights are ignored.
Education: the disproportionate representation of women who face a higher entry requirement to tertiary education; some ethnic groups have no access to education; some communities unaware of the government subsidy for primary aged children - the principles of transparency and non-discrimination are not present.

Economic Land Concessions: land is taken with no negotiation or compensation - no rule of law.

Day 2:

**Understanding the Concept of Accountability in Human Rights Terms - An Introduction to Human Rights Mechanisms – Professor Virginia Dandan.**

Professor Dandan challenged the dismissal by some states of international criticism of their human rights record, reminding participants that when a state ratifies a human rights treaty it is voluntarily accepting accountability to the international community. As signatories to UN treaties and conventions states have obligations to *Respect, Protect and Fulfil* human rights and are held accountable for human rights through international scrutiny.

The human rights monitoring mechanism in the UN system includes:

1. The *Universal Periodic Review* of all the member states,
2. *Special Procedures* involving either individual or working group experts reporting and advising on human rights and
3. *Treaty Bodies* monitoring the implementation of the core international treaties.

Following Professor Dandan’s presentation on reporting to the treaty bodies, including the opportunities for non-Government organisations (NGOs) to engage, participants took part in the second practical exercise of the program:

**Guided Group Work in Parallel Reporting to the UN Treaty Bodies.**

Presentations focused on:

The Right to Food; The Right to the Highest Attainable Standard of Health (access to maternal health care in Myanmar); The Right to Water (Kadah mining); The Right to Education (exclusion of Indigenous women and children).

Professor Dandan reminded participants that when submitting information, whether to the treaty body, Special Procedures or Universal Periodic Review, information should be accurate and precise, specific cases should be cited not generalisations and recommendations made that have a great sense of urgency.

Day 3:

**Economic Social and Cultural Rights: Working with a Human Rights Lens in Poverty and Development**

How to incorporate human rights standards into your work - Professor Virginia Dandan

Professor Dandan made the distinction that while human rights and development are complementary concepts, a purely human development assessment may not be able to pick up the vulnerabilities and exclusion of some sectors of society – the denial of human rights to some.

“**What is poverty?**” Before giving her input on poverty Professor Dandan encouraged the participants to reach consensus group definitions of poverty.

Economic, Social and Cultural Rights have a particular relevance to poverty and development. Looking at development through a human rights lens emphasises participation and a focus on those most denied their rights. It ensures that issues of gender discrimination are addressed, in a way that involves all affected and recognises that process can be as important as outcomes. Development solutions imposed from outside are rarely sustainable and effective.

The subsequent practical session encouraged the participants to explore how they can more consciously integrate human rights principles into their work with communities.

**Day 4:**

**The Right to Free, Prior and Informed Consent – Serena Lillywhite**

The focus on development, participation and human rights continued with Serena Lillywhite, Mining Advocacy Lead with Oxfam Australia. Serena’s first session focused on Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) – *collective* rights of Indigenous Peoples to control of their land and resources, an exercise in **self-determination** and a **mechanism** to participate in decision making.

This right to FPIC is particularly important to communities concerned about the impact of large-scale development projects, mining etc. It is a right specific to Indigenous peoples, but it reflects also human rights principles around participation, transparency and accountability. The presentation focussed on what FPIC means in practice.

Serena explained that there were many different dimensions of participation – including the need to take specific measures to ensure that women are involved in decision-making processes. It was clarified that FPIC is a right in the *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* and ILO 169 – and the principles underlying it are relevant to good development practice and all communities.

- “**Free**” implies no coercion, intimidation or manipulation,
- “**Prior**” implies that consent is obtained in advance of the activity associated with the decision being made, and includes the time necessary to allow Indigenous peoples to undertake their own decision-making processes,
- “**Informed**” implies that Indigenous peoples have been provided all information relating to the activity and that the information is objective, accurate and presented in a manner and form understandable to Indigenous peoples,
- “**Consent**” implies that Indigenous peoples have agreed to the activity that is the subject of the relevant decision, which may also be subject to conditions.

**EMRIP**
Oxfam has produced, and translated into many languages in the region, a very practical guide on Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) which explain the 7 steps involved in FPIC.

1. Find out who is developing the project
2. Request information from project developers
3. Community discussion
4. Negotiating with the company
5. Seek independent advice
6. Make decisions as a community
7. Ongoing communication with project developers.

A Forum Theatre, directed by Serena and prepared for by some of the participants, involved a scripted community consultation with opportunities at the end of each scene for the audience to propose amendments based on the 7 FPIC steps.

**Human Rights and Business – the UN Framework and Guiding Principles - Professor Paul Redmond**

The afternoon sessions of Day 4 introduced participants to the UN Framework on Business and Human Rights. Professor Redmond explained how states have been weakened by globalisation..... ‘multinationals are now exercising powers that only states possessed previously’.

Paul traced the development of efforts through the UN to hold corporations accountable for their actions back to 1972. These efforts have taken different forms in response to pressure for action from civil society and some governments. There have been company and sector wide codes of conduct, and multi-stakeholder initiatives that address environmental, labour and human rights impacts. Efforts to develop a binding international treaty with an accountability mechanism have been frustrated so far. The OECD Guidelines on MNEs does provide a complaints mechanism. There is now a UN framework on business and human rights that sets out the responsibilities of government and business. This framework has three pillars – the state duty to protect, the corporations responsibility to respect, the duty of both to provide access to remedy. The UN Human Rights Council had adopted this framework and a set of Guiding Principles for its implementation.

In a practical exercise participants were asked to develop, and explain to the communities being displaced by a steel plant in remote India, a strategy to protect the rights of affected communities involving the use of legal remedies and corporate social responsibility codes.

**Day 5:**
**Human rights and Business –Case Studies from Burma: Learning from Experience**

The morning session began with Aung Myo Min providing some of the history and overview of the current environment in which business is operating in Myanmar today. Three case studies involving major development projects were presented - the Thilawa Development Project; Dawai Deep Sea Port and SEZ; and the Crude Oil and Natural Gas Pipelines traversing the country to deliver gas to China. In each of the case studies there has been significant impact on the communities whose lands are affected and similar stories of limited or no consultation, environmental destruction, land and water grabbing, forced relocations, failure to provide any or inadequate compensation, loss of jobs, livelihoods and ability to maintain cultural practices. As Ye Lin Myint highlighted communities have been active in organising opposition against these projects which disproportionately deliver benefits to foreign companies.
The OECD Guidelines – Serena Lillywhite

Following on from the panel Serena Lillywhite introduced participants to the OECD Guidelines on Multi National Enterprises. These guidelines apply to companies that are located in, or financed from, OECD countries. Under the guidelines companies are expected to contribute to sustainable development, to respect human rights, to uphold labour and environmental protection laws and to exercise good governance throughout their operations. Uniquely in the area of human rights and business there is a complaints mechanism that can be used by NGOs to mediate allegations of breaches of the OECD Guidelines. These complaints are lodged at National Contact Points (NCPs) that governments in OECD countries must establish.

Practical Exercise

To deepen understanding of the OECD guidelines and to build awareness of the steps involved in accessing the NCP structure, the participants were given a group exercise that asked them to prepare for mediation over their complaint. The task included preparing an opening statement comprised of the key points of the case and recommendations for the company. Following the role plays, where participants encountered differing reactions in the mediation process, Serena emphasised the importance of being very strategic in preparing for mediation. She advised being clear about the chapters of the OECD guidelines that are relevant to the situation; remembering that financiers can be lobbied; being specific about the outcomes being sought from the mediation and ensuring that recommendations are achievable.

Day 6:

Field Trip

Aung Myo Min had organised for the participants to visit two community organisations for an exchange on the responses of civil society to human rights challenges. The morning visit was to the Myanmar Office for Transparency and Accountability (MATA). This is an alliance formed to support the participation of CSOs in the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative. Considerable effort has been invested in developing the structure of MATA, modelling the standards of transparency, inclusivity and commitment to sharing information that MATA is demanding from business, including from the extractive sector.

In the afternoon the participants enjoyed the hospitality and opportunity to learn about the work of Phan Tee Eain (Creative Home) an organisation committed to empowering women and building women’s representation in government and other leadership positions.

Day 7: Rest Day

Day 8:

Indigenous Peoples Rights and the UN system- Joshua Cooper
Joshua Cooper travelled to Yangon directly from the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII). He took the participants through the history of Indigenous peoples’ engagement with the UN System, a remarkable story of achievement from the initial rejection of Indigenous participation in the 1920s to the effective Indigenous representation and engagement seen today in the UN.

Joshua provided an outline of the history leading to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Declaration) and the inspiring story of Indigenous Peoples advocating to have their voices included in the United Nations.

There are currently 3 bodies at the United Nations focused on the rights of Indigenous Peoples:

1. The United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII) - created by Indigenous people in 2001 the UNPFII meets annually for 2 weeks. Webcasts enable people to follow the meeting;
2. The Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples- Vicky Tauli Corpus has just been elected Special Rapporteur for the next three years. The SR makes country visits and presents thematic reports. James Anaya (former SR) has his reports on mining and business on the internet;

Joshua also provided an update from the UNPFII on preparations for the 1st World Conference on Indigenous Peoples.

The Universal Periodic Review

Part of the strategy to build engagement with Indigenous Peoples and their concerns has included using the UN Human Rights Council’s Universal Periodic Review Process (UPR) to get recommendations to governments focused on implementing the Declaration. The UPR process complements and builds on the UN’s other human rights accountability mechanisms – the treaty bodies and Special Procedures. Findings from different treaty bodies and the Special Procedures are brought into the consideration of state reports, reinforcing the human rights framework outlined in documents such as the Declaration. Every member state of the UN has now been through this process once, and the second round of reviews is focussing on progress made in implementing the recommendations from the first round.

The UPR Role Play

The participants took part in a facilitated role play designed to give them an experience on how the UPR review of governments’ record on human rights works in practise and on the opportunities and challenges for civil society in engaging, both formally and informally, with the process.
Joshua was able to provide valuable insights from his experience of working with Indigenous peoples’ organisations using the UN system and to give very practical tips to participants on effective lobbying.

Day 9 and 10:

**Advocacy and Campaigning – Debbie Stothard and Bobbie Sta Maria**

Bobbie Sta Maria from the Business and Human Rights Centre commenced her presentation with a tally of examples of non-state human rights abuses, and a review on the recent developments at the UN on Business and Human Rights. She encouraged participants to engage with her organisation, the Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, which provides a weekly update on both positive and negative news on the performance of business in applying the UN Guiding Principles. Businesses, which fail to respond to questions or concerns raised by civil society, will often respond when the queries come from the Business and Human Rights Resource Centre. The Centre has a website which lists companies with good and bad records.

Debbie Stothard, founding Director of ALTASEAN and recently appointed as Secretary General of FIDH, was inspired by the student uprising in Burma in 1988 and has been working in support for human rights in Myanmar ever since. The focus of Debbie’s work is advocacy and she works across borders to support civil society. Some of the key points she encouraged participants to consider when planning their advocacy include:

- tailoring the style of the advocacy to the situation;
- A stakeholder assessment is useful—think about why your target group might be persuaded to act
- risk management and being aware of what may go wrong and having a contingency plan
- documentation and evidence are essential for your credibility
- capacity building— you need to do advocacy with others. empowering everyone to be part of the solution;
- the core message is the foundation of your advocacy work— usually made up of information about the problem, the impact, why it is occurring and what needs to be the response;
- energy: to do advocacy your ‘on’ button needs to be on, your topic is urgent;
- remember you have “fairy godmothers and godfathers”: key contacts who can help you e.g. DTP trainers.

Debbie and Bobbie provided some case studies of effective campaigns that encouraged business to meet their obligations under the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. **Wake Up Disney**: Rainforest Action Network ran a campaign which drew the link between creating happiness for children in the developed world and the unhappiness of poor Indian children whose forests were being destroyed in order to provide the paper for Disney publications. Disney agreed not to source paper from the two companies whose materials were made from Indian rainforests. Rainforest Action Network then promoted this positive response, issuing a statement commending Disney.

“Just as human rights law was initially developed as a response to the power of states, now there is a need to respond to the growing power of private enterprise, which affects the lives of millions of people around the world.”

DTP Alumnus and media researcher, Nwet Kaykhine, talked with the participants about some of the opportunities and challenges related to freedom of expression in Myanmar.

A practical exercise was developed around case studies encouraging participants to bring together the topics and skills focussed on throughout the program including the international laws, rules and guidelines that could be useful to the case and the strategies which might be effective in achieving solutions. Participants were encouraged to reflect on their own, and each other’s, work.

Evaluation and Closing

The final formal session of the day was the completion of participant evaluations.

These are not my friends, these are my brothers and sisters.
Participant. Oral Evaluation

Human Rights in Advocacy for Development and Business concluded with an oral evaluation and the certificate presentation ceremony. Special guest, President U Win Mra, (Chairperson of Myanmar Human Rights Commission) joined the participants for the awarding of the certificates.

The Diplomacy Training Program would like to acknowledge the committed effort and spirit of collaboration and friendship brought to the program by the participants. We welcome them to the network of DTP alumni, we wish them well and we look forward to hearing about their future work and endeavours.

7. Reflections and Recommendations

- In the course of the planning and delivery of ‘Human Rights in Advocacy for Development and Business’ a number of new contacts with civil society organisations in Myanmar were established. These organisations are playing a crucial role in responding to key human rights challenges such as intercultural/ethnic tensions; discriminatory land laws and the conflicts arising in contracted investment sites. Relationships with organisations such as Myanmar Institute for Peace and Security Studies, the Business and Human Rights Centre, the Kachin Peace Network, MATA, Phan Tee Eain and others provide opportunities for DTP to ensure that future training in Myanmar responds to key issues of concern, is accessed by participants best positioned to effectively implement the knowledge and skills, that methodologies and resources respond to learning needs and that DTP is able to support the continuing efforts of partners in Myanmar to protect the rights of civil society.
- There is a need for DTP to build on this training and on the contacts established and of future human rights and advocacy training programs should continue to focus on the relationship between new development projects initiated by foreign investors and internal displacements and ethnic tensions.
- There would be value in holding a training program outside of Yangon to enable even wider participation from the many ethnic groups in Myanmar.
- DTP should continue to work with alumni in Myanmar to support the building of networks to increase the capacity of civil society to ensure that their advocacy efforts are effective.

8. Participant’s Evaluation
Human Rights in Advocacy for Development and Business

Yangon, Myanmar, May 19 – 28, 2014

Summary of 2014 Feedback from Participants

‘The training exceeded my expectations. I expected to get basic information but it was incredible to get [the level] of information and all the case studies ...you can’t get this in books!’

Summary:

Twenty-five community advocates from the Asia Pacific region joined the inaugural DTP Human Rights in Advocacy for Business and Development training program held in Yangon, Myanmar. This ten day program was developed to contribute to the capacity of community advocates to more effectively access national and international human rights mechanisms and to effectively respond to the opportunities and challenges associated with rapid economic development.

Participants had the opportunity to evaluate the training program through a variety of methods and at different points throughout the training.

End of day feedback: At the commencement of the program participants were allocated to a training group for the duration of the course. The purpose of the group was to help the course facilitators in organising and managing one or more days of the training program. One of the responsibilities of the group was to meet with course facilitators to provide general feedback on the progress of the program. Group members gave input on what was working well and what could be improved on and made recommendations in relation to content/ process and/or logistics. A continuous improvement process was aimed for and amendments based on participant advice were acted upon.

Topic Evaluations: participants completed a short anonymous evaluation questionnaire after key topics had been delivered. The questionnaire sought to gauge the participants’ response to the content, the methodology and the presenters. The purpose of this progressive evaluation was:

- to monitor the extent to which objectives and expectations were being met in order to identify if amendments to the program were required
- to collect more accurate information by reducing the time delay between delivery and evaluation.

Mid-point expectation review. After the first five days of the training had been delivered, time was allocated to a process designed to review participants’ expectations of the training.

Group presentations/outputs of practical activities. DTP training programs emphasise participatory learning. This is in recognition both that learners bring significant experience and expertise to the program and also that learning is more effective if participants are given the opportunity to relate knowledge and skills content to the practical realities of their lives. The group presentations/ feedback
also enable trainers to gauge the extent to which participants are finding the content accessible and applicable. Trainers, in consultation with course facilitators amend and adapt their sessions in response.

**End of Training Participant Evaluation:** At the conclusion of the program participants anonymously completed an evaluation questionnaire and participated in a group oral reflection on the program. The evaluation questionnaire was predominantly qualitative in nature, and asked participants to provide general feedback on their program experience. The questions prompted them to reflect on what they had learnt throughout the course of the 10-day program and the relevance and applicability of the information, skills and networking for their work and community involvements.

(A complete copy of the transcribed evaluation questionnaires is available upon request).

The participants evaluated *The Human Rights in Advocacy for Development and Business* very favourably.

**Topic One: Human Rights and the United Nations**

Table 1 Summary of Topic One Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Objectives for Topic. Having completed Days 1-3, I feel I can:</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Identify the relevant human rights principles and values related to the work and concerns of my community/organisation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) identify the human rights accountability mechanisms at the UN</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Explain how the universal human rights standards and principles can be incorporated into development activities to alleviate poverty</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Presentation of Topic</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Your knowledge before the presentation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Your knowledge after the presentation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The relevance of the presentation to your needs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Presenter's use of participatory activities</td>
<td>16¹</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Presenter's communication skills</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹: Two respondents rated this question as strongly disagree.
1 One participant marked both ‘Very Good’ and ‘Good’ for one question. NB One participant left he program before completing the end of training evaluation.

**Topic One** on Human Rights and the United Nations was well received in relation to both its objectives and presentation.

All 24 participants either strongly agreed (13) or agreed (11) that they were able to identify the relevant human rights principles and values related to their work. The response was similar in participant’s perception of their ability to identify the human rights accountability mechanisms at the UN, and, with the exception of one participant, participants also saw themselves as being able to explain how universal human rights standards and principles could be incorporated into development activities to alleviate poverty. However, this participant described herself as having increased her knowledge from before the presentation from ‘Fair’ to ‘Very good’ upon completion of Topic One.

Most participants indicated an increase in their knowledge following Topic One, with 19 out of 24 participants (79.2%) describing their knowledge as ‘good’. Four participants considered their knowledge to be very good after the presentations. 20 participants (83.3%) perceived their knowledge to be fair or poor prior to the training.

Comments provided by participants provided useful feedback, which will be incorporated into subsequent programs.

- Presentation slides be distributed every evening after the training so that they may be used and applied.
- Terms and definitions of human rights be provided to assist with understanding terminology.
- the manual should be divided into different sections, but with an explanation on how they integrate with each other.
- time is allotted to drafting a complaint to the Special Rapporteur.

Overall, all participants very favourably received Topic One.

**Topic Two: Free Prior and Informed Consent/OECD Guidelines**

**Table 2 Summary of Topic Two Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Objectives for Topic Having completed Topic 2, I feel I can:</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Explain what the terms FREE, PRIOR and INFORMED CONSENT mean for Indigenous peoples.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Describe how the OECD guidelines can be used to hold companies accountable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Describe the possible benefits and problems in seeking to bring a complaint under the OECD guidelines

|          | 7         | 14   | 1    |      |

2. Presentation of Topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Your knowledge before the presentation</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Your knowledge after the presentation</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. The relevance of the presentation to your needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d. Presenter’s use of participatory activities</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Presenter’s communication skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with the topic covered in the first three days of the program, Topic Two on Free Prior and Informed Consent and the OECD Guidelines was also positively received. All participants agreed or strongly agreed that they could now explain what Free, Prior and Informed Consent meant for Indigenous peoples, as well as how OECD guidelines could be used to hold companies accountable.

Just under half of the participants saw themselves as having a poor understanding in this topic prior to the presentations. Following the presentations, 72.7% saw themselves as having a good or very good understanding. This highlights that the presentations, on the whole, successfully achieved the goal of increasing the knowledge levels of the participants.

The participants overwhelmingly assessed the relevance of the presentation to their needs to be good (50%) or very good (45.5%). The one participant who considered the presentations to be fairly relevant made no further comment, but did indicate that his knowledge had increased from poor to fair following the training.

As with the previous topic, the presenter was also favourably assessed. All participants considered the use of participatory activities to be good or very good. Around 60% of participants thought that the presenter’s presentation skills were very good.

Main comments to come out of the feedback suggest:

- more time could be allotted to this topic. One participant, in particular, commented that more time for practical activities would be useful while another participant suggested that the presentations could contain more examples and experiences from the ground.
• Participants also commented that the topic was very interesting and will be useful in future work.

End of Training Evaluation
Table 3 Summary of End of Training Evaluation Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART A. Content and Process</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Workshop Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. that I am better able to use international human rights agreements and processes in my work</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. that I have stronger skills and confidence to protect and promote the rights of the communities I work with</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. that I have stronger networks in the region that could be helpful to me and my work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Workshop Activities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Were the activities effective in promoting the sharing of experience amongst participants?</td>
<td>18 (^2)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Were the activities effective in integrating theory and practice?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Was the amount of time allotted for activities adequate throughout the session?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Was the combination of presentations and large and small group work appropriate?</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART B. General Comments and Reflections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Did the training meet your expectations?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Two participants marked both 'Yes' and 'Partially' in their responses.

The End of Training Evaluation comprised two parts, one assessing the overall content and process, and the other seeking general feedback and assessing whether the training met participant expectations. Overwhelmingly, participants considered that the training did meet their expectations (87.5%).

Workshop objectives were achieved for all participants. All participants agreed or strongly agreed that they were now better able to use international human rights agreements and processes in their work,
with just under half of the participants expressing strong agreement. They all felt that they had stronger skills and more confidence to protect and promote the rights of their respective communities. The participants also agreed that they now had stronger and more useful networks in the region.

The workshop activities were very successful in facilitating the exchange of experience amongst participants and the participants assessed the activities to be an effective integration of theory and practice. 20 of the 24 participants (83.3%) agreed that they were effective, 3 participants (12.5%) thought that it was partially effective and one participant provided no response.

_I liked every part of the program. Especially when we finished lectures and we did practise for role-play and group presentations. It (very) supported me to have a greater understanding._

The overall balance of time for presentations and group work could possibly have been better. Over half of the participants believed that the allotted amount of time for activities was only partially adequate.

The format of the activities, presentations and large or small group work, was found to be mostly appropriate (75%).

Participants were asked to provide feedback on the following question: **What aspects of the training did you find most useful?** From their responses it was not possible to identify the particular themes, topics or skills that are of most value to participants as almost identical percentages of participants nominated: the meaning of human right and the guiding principles of human rights; the complaint mechanisms; human rights and business and the OECD guidelines; and advocacy strategies and mechanisms as the most useful.

_For me every aspect of the training is most useful_  

The majority of participants nominated either not to provide a response/ or to indicate that they were unable to nominate any aspects of the program to the category least useful. Some individual responses commented on the need to improve the manual, some presenters’ talking too quickly, content areas that the one participant was already very familiar with and were unrelated to the work of another participant as aspects least useful. One participant also felt that, given the content load the program was too short and two participants used this question to comment on the ‘busyness’ of the program.

The perceptions of a number of participants about human rights and advocacy seemed to have broadened as a result of the program. As one participant noted,

_Knowing human rights in a wider way makes me think more carefully about the cause and effect of the problem._

_YES, now I see the bigger picture of human rights. There are a lot of things we can do behind human rights. Before this training I just knew that there were human rights – that’s it. Now I know how to make use of them to protect our people._
Some participants noted that their understanding of the focus of advocacy had broadened to include working with governments and businesses, as well as affected communities, and others reported that they had a stronger sense of the value of engaging with the United Nations. Some participants felt that they had clearer understanding about how to be more effective in their advocacy, one participant noting the usefulness of diplomacy to .... *escape from blaming and shaming games*.

**Future Plans**

At the end of the program nearly all participants could identify ways in which they intended to implement the information and /or skills built throughout the course of the program. Some participants reported that they would be accessing the UN mechanisms;

...*for advocacy with a foreign investment company,*

...*knowing which complaints mechanisms and treaty bodies to send reports and complaints will be useful to assist in helping victims of human rights injustices,*

...*to use in ongoing work with mega projects not following the guidelines,*

...*to make a complaint to the relevant special rapporteur.*

The knowledge gained on development, human rights and business and the rights of Indigenous Peoples was also seen as valuable for ‘...*investigation visits to mining projects and special economic zones* and for clearer reporting and providing effective recommendations to different stakeholders ensuing from research.

One participant shared their intention to make more use of FPIC in the community development project work they were involved in, another reported that she would be applying the information with clients, subcommittees and stakeholders to ‘...*ensure that her organisation will be a more responsible business.*’

Almost all of the participants completed the program with a commitment to share the training, either with their colleagues working on a project ‘...*the people collaborating on a particular hydro power case*’ or in their organisation ‘...*share it in the Commission meeting and staff meeting*’ and ‘...*let colleagues know about FPIC*’. One participant intended to bring together a ‘*youth conversation club*’ to share the knowledge, another to share the powerpoints provided by the trainers and two others to plan their own training.
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Cambodia
Samrach Phally, “Bo”, Community Legal Education Center (CLEC)
Samrach is a legal assistant who works for CLEC, which exists under the Land and Natural Resources Unit. CLEC focuses on defending high profile land cases involving urban, rural and Indigenous forced evictions. Through his role, Samrach works closely with communities to strengthen their knowledge about their legal rights, and is also involved in media strategy and lobbying government authorities. Samrach hopes the training program will increase his awareness and understanding of Indigenous issues in the Asia-Pacific area, as well as international and regional human rights standards for the protection of Indigenous Peoples. He also hopes the program will equip him with greater advocacy and lobbying skills.

Mory Sar, Cambodian Youth Network (CYN)
Mory is Vice-President of the CYN, which he helped establish in 2009. CYN is a youth capacity-building association that also undertakes advocacy work to enhance human rights and development. Mory is responsible for coordinating activities in the rural area and Phnom Penh, youth empowerment, strategy, campaign and advocacy work, and fundraising. Through the program, he would like to expand his knowledge on strategies for human rights advocacy, as well as learn more about the success stories of participants in other countries. He also hopes that the program will increase his self-confidence as he assists his community in fighting for their rights to land, livelihood and the environment.

Oudom Ham, ‘Current Ham”, EarthRights International
Oudom is currently the community advocacy consultant for EarthRights International. The position requires him to conduct research, raise awareness and mobilise advocacy activities among the local communities likely impacted by the Don Sahong Dam (in Lao PDR), Lower Sesan 2 dam, and Chhay Araeng Valley dam. He works closely with local communities, local and international NGOs and civil society in order to build awareness about dam impacts, develop strong solidarity and to help build a consensus on potential advocacy strategies among them, to effectively voice community concerns about the lack of transparency and accountability in development projects. Oudom has found that local knowledge of campaigners and NGOs of international mechanisms (which in combination with national law, would be of great assistance) is lacking. He hopes the training program’s coverage of international mechanisms would be able to be integrated into effective advocacy strategies. He expects the training will examine specific standards related to rights of indigenous and vulnerable communities, and the responsibilities of companies, investors and governments to make sure development and investment projects are transparent and accountable to local people.

Myanmar

Ngun Uk Thang, Chin Youth Organisation, Hakha (CYO)
Ngun is the project coordinator of CYO, which undertakes environmental and human rights issues with the aim of promoting and protecting the Chin Indigenous people. Ngun hopes that the training program will assist him in promoting knowledge of human rights, especially Indigenous rights related to the UNDRIP, as well as gain the ability to lobby and advocate at a State and National level.

Saw Eh Say is currently working for the Kayak Earthrights Action Network as a Network Coordinator, and is responsible for organising and enabling communities to defend their rights. His particular focus is land rights, such as the land registration process, and the impacts of development projects on the 24 communities in the Kayah state. Through KEAN, Saw Eh Say also educates communities on the new land laws which passed in 2012. They are particularly problematic as they are not protective of local land. KEAN is also involved with documenting and fact finding with regards to earth rights abuses, in an effort to hold those involved accountable. Saw Eh Say is aiming to gain more knowledge of advocacy through the program, and then share this knowledge with his colleagues and the communities he works with. He feels the training will empower him in his understanding of human rights and their mechanisms for promoting local people and access to their rights.

Wai Let Lu, Telenor Myanmar Limited
As the project coordinator of Corporate Social Responsibility activities for Telenor Myanmar, Myanmar’s nationwide telecommunications provider, Wai Let is responsible for negotiating and coordinating with contractors on their various CSR projects. Her role is to arrange stakeholder engagement meetings, support presentations and facilitate community discussion. As a beginner to human rights advocacy, she hopes to be introduced to the different instruments and avenues for protecting human rights and learn more about how Telenor can contribute to those in need. She further hopes to network with fellow participants at the training.

Khun Maung Htee, “Khun Htee”, EarthRights International (ERI)
Khun Htee is the school alumni program coordinator for EarthRights Myanmar. Through his role, Khun Htee supports alumni to become community leaders and strong civil society advocates working to protect earth rights in their communities. ERI is a non-profit organisation that combines the power of law and the power of people in defence of human rights and the environment. ERI’s core mission is to support people when there are environmental issues that overlap with human rights violations that
affect the people’s rights. ERI conducts fact-finding and legal actions against abusers, trains grassroots and community leaders, and carries out advocacy campaigns. Khun Htee is responsible for providing assistance on the development of campaign activities. He hopes the training program will equip him with specific and advanced knowledge on international legal advocacy strategies, especially in regards to engaging government and businesses. As he will be leading land mining and land rights advocacy workshops in the near future, he believes he will greatly benefit from what the program has to offer.

Su Sandar Koe, Progetto Continenti Myanmar (PC Myanmar)
As a program coordinator for PC Myanmar, Su Sandar Koe’s work concerns alleviating poverty and food insecurity in the Dry Zone, particularly in the Magway Division. She is responsible for the overall management of program implementation and coordination with partner organisations, as well as providing technical support and capacity-building activities to field and mid-level staff to ensure that activities are empowered through participation. She also designs, plans, monitors and evaluates projects, and liaises with donors and government departments. Su Sandar Koe hopes that by learning more about human rights activities and strategies for promoting human rights, she can strengthen the advocacy work undertaken by her organisation. She also hopes to share her own experiences and is open to learning from other participants, so that they may brainstorm solutions together to enforce and promote human rights in the region.

Kyi Min Han, Thabyay Education Foundation (TEF)
Kyi is a project officer with TEF, which develops programs focusing on access to higher education, adult education and capacity-building in civil society with the view that education can eradicate the propagation of human rights violations. Kyi is in charge of the Thabyay E-learning Platform Program, which aims to build capacity through online learning for people from Myanmar, Cambodia and on the Thai-Myanmar border. He would like to learn more about the connection between human rights and economic development, strengthen his capacity to promote implementation of projects, and more effectively help and empower victims to protect and promote their rights. He is also looking forward to networking with other human rights organisations and hearing from other participants.

Bo Bo Aung, Dawei Development Association (DDA)
Bo Bo is an executive member and coordinator at DDA, an association focused on green development, property and land rights, and sustainable natural resource management. His main responsibility is to manage resource mobilisation, advocacy and networking, as well as facilitate DDA’s activities inside and outside of Dawei. He would like to see a wider range of coordination among activist groups came out of the program. Bo Bo also hopes that the skills the program will equip him with are useful and appropriate for international advocacy. He also hopes to look at case studies of previous campaigns and learn about successful models from other countries.

Sandar Cho, Myanmar Centre for Responsible Business (MCRB)
Sandar is currently working as a field researcher at MCRB — a new initiative to encourage responsible business in Myanmar. MCRB aims to be an independent and self-sustaining entity providing a crucial platform for parties across Myanmar to exchange ideas and build capacity on responsible business practices and investment in Myanmar. Sandar completed a groundbreaking study of nationwide sector wide assessments on the impact of foreign direct investment particularly in the oil and gas sector. She anticipates that the program will help her better understand the rights of Indigenous Peoples, which may then be applied in research and during consultations and used in policy advocacy.

Naw Thaw Thi Bweh, “Eh Thaw”, Karen Human Rights Group (KHRG)
As the information processing coordinator for KHRG, a small, independent group documenting the rights of ordinary people in rural Myanmar, Eh Thaw is responsible for many of the duties required for the smooth operation of the group. She works in human resources to hire and train new members and research fellows, processes incoming information, undertakes translation work from English into local languages and assists in putting out the organisational reports and newsletters. Eh Thaw also actively participates and provides support for advocacy activities. She is looking forward to improving the skills required for her advocacy work so that she can support her Indigenous group more effectively. She hopes that the training program will help her learn more about the specific rights of Indigenous Peoples and gain useful knowledge and additional tips as KHRG begin advocating at a national level. She also hopes to expand the network of organisations working on similar issues in the ASEAN region.

**Dr Nyan Zaw, Myanmar National Human Rights Commission**

Dr Nyan Zaw is a Commissioner in the International Relations Division of the Myanmar National Human Rights Commission. His role involves examining complaints, conducting investigation visits and providing human rights education in the states/regions including in Rakhine State, Mon State, and Mandalay Division. Dr Nyan Zaw and the Commission have been involved in visiting the conflict area in Rakhine communities and providing statements to the media. Dr Nyan Zaw hopes to be able to apply the information on the right to development, Indigenous peoples rights, human rights and business and the UPR into the human rights training provided by the Commission.

**Aung Myo Hein**

Aung Myo Hein is a researcher on the issues around the rights of marginalised groups. He has participated in and researched the rights of Myanmar migrants in Thailand, the collective actions of grassroots communities in defending and promoting their rights in Ayeyarwaddy and the social, economic and human rights impacts of oil and gas industry in Myanmar. Being an enthusiastic student from Myanmar, which is experiencing political and economic liberalisation, Aung would like to have a deeper understanding of possible and potential impacts of the process on human rights especially for marginalised communities. He would also like to understand how the human rights of the people in their relations with business could be best respected, protected and mitigated by governments and corporations through existing convention and treaties.

**Shwe Yee Oo, Foundation for Education and Development (FED)**

Shwe Yee has been working as a project assistant with Foundation for Education and Development (FED) facilitating workshops, forums and trainings as well as the daily administration of the office. She has also been involved in developing and implementing English language programs and also an interfaith workshop called “Building peaceful co-existence between Buddhists and Muslims”.

**Hkaw Bown Maran, Kachin Legal Aid Network Group**

Hkaw Bown is a member of the Kachin Legal Aid Network Group assisting with the Kachin State EITI Process. The Kachin Legal Aid Network Group provides legal awareness training to youth in Myitkyina and represented Kachin State in developing CSO Statements to the 2014 ASEAN Peoples Forum. Khaw Bown is also a sports leader with the Tatkon Baptist Church (Youth). Khaw Bown believes that this training is very relevant to the work of the Kachin Legal Aid Network Group.

**Zam Za Mung, Zomi Congress for Democracy**
Zam Za Mung is the secretary of the Zomi Congress for Democracy. His work with the Zomi Congress for Democracy has involved organising identity campaigns in his township area for the inclusion of Zomi in the last census.

**India**

*Majabung Gangmei, All Tribal Students’ Union, Manipur (ATSUM) and Zeliangrong Boudi (ZB)*

Majabung is the Speaker, Assembly Affairs, of both ATSUM and ZB. He looks after assembly affairs and plans out daily operations of the organisations. His work has looked at human rights violation in regards to construction of mega dams as a result of petroleum exploration. He hopes that, through the training, he will gain more knowledge so that he may advocate for the rights of Indigenous Peoples on their behalf.

**Indonesia**

*Feby Let Fanny Mnubefor Boseren, “Fanny”, Yayasan Anak Dusun Papua (YADUPA), and Generasi Muda untuk Hak Adat (GEMPHA)*

Fanny is a chief, and takes part in meetings and lobbying on current issues in Papua. Her organisations have been involved with defending community rights to customs, and protection of their rights to land, ground, water, and other natural resources which are a source of life. Fanny would like to learn more about how to assist Indigenous society through protection and empowerment, and recognition of culture as part of identity.

*Angganeta Laurina Ap, “Anita”, Yayasan Anak Dusun Papua (YADUPA), and Generasi Muda untuk Hak Adat (GEMPHA)*

Anita is a member of YADUPA and GEMPHA, and takes part in meetings and lobbying on current issues in Papua. Her organisations have been involved with defending community rights to customs, and protection of their rights to land, ground, water, and other natural resources which are a source of life. Fanny would like to learn more about how to assist indigenous society through protection and empowerment, and recognition of culture as part of identity.

*Yulia Sri Sukapti, “Sri”, The Institute for ECOSOC Rights*

After a decade in economic and business studies Sri has recently joined The Institute for ECOSOC Rights as a researcher. She assists with project design for programs for local communities, especially in Central Kalimantan. Through the training program, she hopes to improve her skills and knowledge on local communities and Indigenous Peoples, expand her network and cooperate with others to bring the ‘spirit of togetherness’ in human rights campaigns.

*Elon Paris Mampasuri Semboari, Yayasan Anak Dusun Papua (YADUPA) and Generasi Muda untuk Hak Adat “(GEMPHA) “Elon”*

Elon is currently working as the treasurer of GEMPHA, which works with Indigenous youths in Papua to nurture their cultural identity through social media and networking. As the treasurer he undertakes all the accounting work of the organisation, as well as assists in advocacy work. He hopes that his experience in training program will improve his knowledge and skills so that they may be used in advocacy work and help his organisation grow and develop.

*Reslian Pardede, “Lian”, The Institute for ECOSOC Rights*

Lian works for The Institute for ECOSOC Rights as a researcher on issues related to social development and business. She is involved in designing research projects, data collection, data analysis, and writing, as well as presenting the research. She expects that the training will provide the Institute with new
frameworks and guidelines to support their work on managing communities, environment, business and human rights. Lian hopes that the training will allow them to develop networks and build her skills and capacities in practical advocacy so that she may engage more effectively with government, media and private sector.

Priadi
Priadi is a member of the Lawyers Committee of the Indonesian Human Rights Committee for Social Justice. His work involves drafting legislation that is directly related to the public interest, providing legal training and advocacy for Indigenous communities, representing vulnerable groups in cases involving corporations, the military and government and reporting to the National Commission on Human Rights. Priadi is hoping that the training will contribute to his ability to advocate for Indigenous and vulnerable groups and that it will enable him to build networks to exchange ideas on issues of advocacy and to strengthen regional and international networking on human rights advocacy.

Nepal
Pratima Gurung, Nepal Indigenous Disabled Association (NIDA)
Pratima is the executive treasurer of NIDA, an organisation advocating for the rights of Indigenous People with disabilities (IPWDs). She is intimately involved in the daily operations of the association, from coordinating meetings to programs, to holding fundraising activities and reporting. Pratima also works as a mediator to inform and sensitize on issues affecting IPWDs and liaises with concerned stakeholders to reinforce international conventions and instruments. She lobbies different organisations and governments across the board. As a teacher, she also engages in research to document issues relating to IPWDs to be used as the foundation of her advocacy work. She hopes to raise awareness of issues affecting IPWDs during the program, and would like to see the training build capacity in relevant stakeholders for more effective advocacy. Pratima also expects that the training will allow participants to interact with each other and share their experiences, with a view to building practical solidarity networks.
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**Professor Virginia Dandan**
Virginia Dandan is the UN Independent Expert on Human Rights and International Solidarity and former Chair of the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (UNCESCR) - serving on the Committee as an independent expert from 1990 to 2010. In these roles Virginia was responsible for monitoring state performance on economic, social and cultural rights, and engaging in dialogues with senior state officials, NGOs and independent experts on the matter. She has an enduring commitment to human rights education as a tool for social transformation and has conducted extensive research on issues concerning the right to take part in cultural life. Virginia has also served as National Program Manager for the Human Rights Community Development Project, a bilateral program between the Philippine Commission on Human Rights and the New Zealand Human Rights Commission that works with grassroots Indigenous communities in the Philippines. In addition to her academic and practical human rights work, Virginia is also an accomplished artist having solo exhibited her paintings and sculptures in the Philippines and internationally. She was the former Dean of the College of Fine Arts at the University of the Philippines.

**Serena Lillywhite**
Serena Lillywhite is the Mining Advocacy Coordinator at Oxfam Australia. She is an active corporate responsibility practitioner, researcher and advocate. She is currently working to improve the human rights practices of Australian mining companies. She has extensive expertise and experience in labour rights, supply chain management and business and human rights. Serena is Australia’s leading expert in the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises. She is a regular speaker at the OECD, UN and ILO, and other international CSR platforms. Serena works regularly with the business community to foster dialogue and multi-stakeholder approaches to responsible business conduct and grievance mechanisms. Serena holds a Masters in International Business from the University of Melbourne. She has lived and worked in China, and as a member of the OECD Watch network and Coordinating Committee, has delivered training and capacity building in Ghana (extractive sector), India (garment sector) and Thailand (business and human rights).

**Joshua Cooper**
Joshua Cooper is an academic in human rights law, political science and journalism, non-violent social movements, ecological justice in Oceania and Indigenous peoples' rights. He lectures at a number of universities and educational institutions worldwide including the University of Hawaii, the International Training Center for Teaching Peace and Human Rights in Geneva, Galway University in Ireland and the University of the District of Columbia in Washington D.C. He also performs a number of leadership and supervisory roles, including as an Asia Pacific Leadership Program Fellow at the East-West Center, Area Coordinator for Amnesty International USA, Senior Advisor to the Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization in the Hague, Board member of Peace Action, Board member of the Human Rights Task Force for the United National Association of the USA, and former Chair of the AIUSA Indigenous Peoples Task Force. Josh has also been selected to work with Nobel Peace Prize Laureate and U.S. Vice-President Al Gore on The Climate Project.

**Bobbie Sta Maria, Southeast Asia Researcher & Representative for the Business & Human Rights Resource Centre**
Bobbie has previously worked at Earth Rights international as the Southeast Asia Legal Program Coordinator based in Thailand. In that role she worked with advocates throughout South East Asia to
seek redress for corporate human rights and environmental abuses. Further, she has actively worked in the region with the goal of engaging regional mechanisms such as ASEAN in order to promote the rule of law and a sound business and human rights regime.

Recently, she has taken part in researching the role of companies in encouraging and facilitating environmentally and socially destructive projects in Southeast Asia.

Previously, Bobbie was a member of the legal staff at SALIGAN (Alternative Legal Assistance Centre Philippines). Here she worked on environmental and domestic abuse cases as well as agrarian reform and gender policy laws. Specifically, her work included assisting villagers affected by the aerial pesticide spraying of banana plantations in Mindanao.

**Professor Paul Redmond, Inaugural Sir Gerald Brennan Research Professor at University of Technology Sydney and Emeritus Professor of Law at the University of New South Wales**

Having corporate law as his major area of specialization, Professor Redmond has been a member of a number of professional and government bodies, including the Corporations Committee of the Business Law Section of the Law Council of Australia and the Australian Journal of corporate law.

While his principal research interests are in corporate and securities law, Professor Redmond also has a research and professional interest in legal education, professional responsibility and in the application of human rights standards to business. He is chair of the DTP, was a founding member of National Pro Bono Resource Centre and has participated in a number of national and international initiatives in legal education.

In 2001, Professor Redmond co-authored a significant report on the reform of legal education and training in Hong Kong. He has been an Honorary Visiting Professor in the School of Law at the Chinese University of Hong Kong.

In 2013 he was appointed a Member of the Order of Australia for significant service to the law through contributions to legal education and professional bodies and to the community.

**Debbie Stothard, Secretary General of the International Federation for Human Rights; Coordinator of the Alternative ASEAN Network on Burma**

Since founding the Alternative ASEAN Network on Burma Debbie has actively participated in the development towards the realisation of democracy in Burma. In doing so she has collaborated with UN and ASEAN institutions throughout the world.

In 2011 she facilitated the first public hearing on Corporate Social Responsibility in ASEAN countries. In 2013 she helped organised a Business and Human Rights Workshop for activists in Rangoon.

Acknowledging the important role played by women in development Debbie developed the first ongoing women-specific training program. It first took place in 1997 and it remains an ongoing initiative with programs taking place across the world including Australia, Burma, China, United Kingdom and the United States of America.

Recently, Debbie has become the Secretary General of the FIDH. Between 2010 and 2013 she represented FIDH on missions/conferences in Belgium, France, Malaysia, Maldives, Peru, Sri Lanka and the United States.
Human Rights in Advocacy for Development and Business

A Training Program for Community Advocates in the Asia Pacific Region

Diplomacy Training Program
Held in Partnership with
Equality Myanmar and
Foundation for Education and Development
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Monday May 19</th>
<th>Tuesday May 20</th>
<th>Wednesday May 21</th>
<th>Thursday May 22</th>
<th>Friday May 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>7.00-7.30 am</td>
<td>8.00-8.30 am</td>
<td>8.30-9.00 am</td>
<td>8.30-9.00 am</td>
<td>8.30-9.00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning 1:</td>
<td>8.30-10.00 am</td>
<td>8.30-10.00 am</td>
<td>8.30-10.00 am</td>
<td>8.30-10.00 am</td>
<td>8.30-10.00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning 1 - 2</td>
<td>Opening Ceremony: Welcome Introduction to DTP and</td>
<td>Understanding the concept of accountability in</td>
<td>Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Poverty and</td>
<td>Principles The Right to Free Prior and Informed</td>
<td>Panel Session: Human Rights and Business – Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>partner organs Participant Introductions</td>
<td>human rights terms – An introduction to human</td>
<td>Development – a human rights based approach to</td>
<td>Consent – (FPIC)</td>
<td>Studies from Burma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations and Principles for working together</td>
<td>rights mechanisms</td>
<td>development/organisation work</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning from Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators</td>
<td>DTP and Partners</td>
<td>Professor Virginia Dandan</td>
<td>Professor Virginia Dandan</td>
<td>Serena Lillywhite</td>
<td>Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 – 10.15</td>
<td>Morning tea</td>
<td>Morning tea</td>
<td>Morning tea</td>
<td>Morning tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning 2</td>
<td>10.30 – 12.00</td>
<td>10.30 – 12.00</td>
<td>10.30 – 12.00</td>
<td>10.30-12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning 2 - 2</td>
<td>Myanmar - Post Democracy Developments and</td>
<td>The Treaty Bodies and General Comments –</td>
<td>Practical Exercise – the case study</td>
<td>The Right to Free Prior and Informed Consent –</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenges.</td>
<td>understanding the meaning of human rights.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(FPIC) Practical Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators</td>
<td>Kyaw Thu; Khon Ja; Khin Ma Ma Myo</td>
<td>Professor Virginia Dandan</td>
<td>Professor Virginia Dandan</td>
<td>Serena Lillywhite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00 – 1.00 pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon 1</td>
<td>1.30-3.00 pm</td>
<td>1.30-3.00 pm</td>
<td>1.30-3.00 pm</td>
<td>1.30-3.00 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon 1 - 2</td>
<td>An introduction to human rights principles,</td>
<td>Guided group work in parallel reporting</td>
<td>Group presentations of case studies</td>
<td>Human Rights and Business – the UN Framework and</td>
<td>Human Rights and Business – The OECD Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>values and standards: The Universal Declaration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guiding Principles</td>
<td>Engaging the Corporation – Practical Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators</td>
<td>Professor Virginia Dandan</td>
<td>Professor Virginia Dandan</td>
<td>Professor Virginia Dandan</td>
<td>Professor Paul Redmond</td>
<td>Serena Lillywhite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00-3.15 pm</td>
<td>Afternoon tea</td>
<td>Afternoon tea</td>
<td>Afternoon tea</td>
<td>Afternoon tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon 2</td>
<td>3.15-5.00 pm</td>
<td>Continuation of Group work – group presentations</td>
<td>Group presentations of Case Studies</td>
<td>Human Rights and Business – the UN Framework and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying human rights issues – interactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guiding Principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Practical Exercise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators</td>
<td>Professor Virginia Dandan</td>
<td>Professor Virginia Dandan</td>
<td>Professor Virginia Dandan</td>
<td>Professor Paul Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td>Diary session</td>
<td>Diary session</td>
<td>Diary session</td>
<td>Diary session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening Activity</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Cultural Night</td>
<td>Reception at the Australian Embassy</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Saturday May 24</th>
<th>Sunday May 25</th>
<th>Monday May 26</th>
<th>Tuesday May 27</th>
<th>Wednesday May 28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.00-7.30</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00-8.30</td>
<td>Field Trip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30-10.00 am</td>
<td>Morning Session 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators</td>
<td>Joshua Cooper</td>
<td>Debbie Stothard</td>
<td>Debbie Stothard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00-10.15 am</td>
<td>Morning tea</td>
<td>Morning tea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15-12.00</td>
<td>Morning Session 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators</td>
<td>Joshua Cooper</td>
<td>Panel: Bobbie Sta Maria; Debbie Stothard</td>
<td>Debbie Stothard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-1.00 pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Session 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators</td>
<td>Josh Cooper</td>
<td>Debbie Stothard</td>
<td>president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30-3.00</td>
<td>Afternoon Session 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators</td>
<td>Josh Cooper</td>
<td>Debbie Stothard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00-3.15 pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15-5.00</td>
<td>Afternoon Session 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators</td>
<td>Josh Cooper</td>
<td>Debbie Stothard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00-5.15 pm</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening Program</td>
<td>Dinner-downtown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>