

## REVIEW OF AIUNNY MDG SUMMIT ACTIVITY 10/30/10

- I. AI Objectives for the MDG Summit
- II. Involvement of AI Sections/Structures
- III. AI Lobbying at UN Headquarters
- IV. Collaboration with Realizing Rights
- V. New York Lobbying Timeline
- VI. Annex A: AI Views on MDG Summit Outcome
- VII. Annex B: AI Sections/Structures Involved in MDG Work
- VIII. Annex C: States that Referred to Human Rights at MDG Summit

### I. AI Objectives for the MDG Summit

On 29 January 2010, an initial action circular (AI Index: IOR 41/002/2010) was issued setting out AI's broad aims about the incorporation of human rights into the MDG framework. The action circular asked AI Sections/Structures to undertake advocacy with their government to help ensure that a significant and regionally diverse number of states highlight the need for MDG efforts to be consistent with human rights obligations. The action circular outlined AI's objective to include in the MDG Summit Outcome document, at the very least, human rights language "hooks" that would provide opportunity for more extensive AI campaigning. Considering that discussions prior to the MDG Summit largely ignored human rights obligations, it was unlikely that AI would be able to get strong language and recommendations that promote human rights in the Outcome Document. However, incorporating even minimum language to that effect could help build international momentum to address key human rights gaps within MDG implementation and incorporate focus on human rights in any global framework for tackling poverty beyond 2015.

On 13 August 2010, the UNGA Action Circular (AI Index: IOR 41/018/2010) was issued. It set out AI's specific objectives for the MDG Summit:

1. The UNGA adopts an MDG Summit Outcome document which includes commitments to promote and protect human rights. Specifically, the Outcome's Action Agenda includes specific commitments, based on human rights standards that ensure the MDGs benefit the most marginalized and disadvantaged people. **(largely achieved)**
2. At least forty Member States express support during the high-level segment of the UNGA for national and international MDG efforts to be based on human rights standards; **(partially achieved)**; and
3. AI's Secretary-General and the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights are invited to take part in the Summit. **(achieved)**

#### *1. Human Rights Commitments in the MDG Summit Outcome*

The MDG Summit Outcome Document A/64/299 was adopted by consensus on 22 September 2010 ([http://www.un.org/ga/search/view\\_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/64/299](http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/64/299)). AI's public response to the Outcome was largely one of disappointment at the failure of the General Assembly to identify concrete steps to address discrimination, exclusion, and the specific barriers many groups face in accessing basic services, as well as at the absence of an accountability mechanism to ensure that commitments made at the Summit are met and that future efforts are consistent with human rights obligations.

However, AI's internal view is that the human rights language incorporated in the Outcome document exceeds AI's initial expectations. In particular, the Outcome document recognized that human rights are integral to effective implementation of the MDGs (OP53); placed emphasis on gender equality and women's full enjoyment of all human rights, and on references to existing commitments to women's rights (OP54; OP72(a),(f),(g),(i),(k)); recognized the need for more efforts to reduce inequality and tackle exclusion and discrimination, and to promote universal access to public and social services (OP28; OP51;

OP55; OP72(b)-(e)); recognized that full participation of all segments of society, including the poor and disadvantaged, in decision making processes can help achieve the MDGs (OP36; OP72(f)); and made references to the importance of the rights to food, education, and health (OP70(u); OP71(a); OP75(a)). See Annex A for detailed AI views on the MDG Summit Outcome document.

## 2. MDG Summit Statements

A total of 67 Member States mentioned human rights in their high level statements during the MDG Summit. See Annex B for a full list of all countries. Although 67 States mentioned human rights, less than 40 States expressed support for national and international MDG efforts to be based on human rights standards. However, a number of States referred to the links between human rights and development and many stressed the important role of human rights in MDG efforts.

**Belgium, Czech Republic, Finland, Holy See, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Netherlands, Samoa, and Switzerland** emphasized strongly the importance of ensuring that development policies be consistent with human rights standards and be based on human rights principles. **Bosnia and Herzegovina** discussed national policies adopted to fulfill international obligations to protect the rights of people with disabilities and ethnic minorities. **Germany, Guyana, Italy, Niger, and Romania** underscored that human rights violations perpetuate poverty and that full respect for human rights is essential for economic and social development. **Angola, Morocco, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, and Palestine** on the other hand, stressed that implementation of the MDGs will ensure respect for and realization of human rights. **Antigua and Barbuda, Burkina Faso, Croatia, and Suriname** stated that the MDGs are an expression of basic human rights. **Afghanistan, Australia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Estonia, Kazakhstan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Peru, Sweden, and USA** recognized the strong links between human rights and development but came short of stating that protection of human rights is essential for the achievement of the MDGs. **Belize, Congo, Gambia, Ireland, Micronesia, and Nepal** focused specifically on the realization of women's rights to accelerate progress on the MDGs. On the other hand, the delegation of the **Holy See** was deeply concerned about references to "sexual and reproductive health" and "family planning" in the Summit Outcome document. The remaining States made only passing references to human rights in their statements.

In addition, the President of the European Commission on behalf of the delegation of **European Union** stressed that extreme poverty is a barrier to the exercise of the most basic human rights. The **UNDP** Administrator noted that lack of human rights is an obstacle to the achievement of the MDGs.

Twenty Member States referred to key cross-cutting principles, such as participation, non-discrimination, inclusion, or gender equality and women's empowerment, without explicitly mentioning human rights. Specifically, **Brazil, Marshall Islands, and Saint Lucia** noted existing domestic challenges in tackling discrimination against women, including gender-based violence. **Cape-Verde, Mongolia, Montenegro, Nigeria, Turkey, Uruguay, and Zimbabwe** focused on the lack of sufficient national progress in advancing gender equality and women's participation in decision-making processes. In addition, **Austria, Bangladesh, Fiji, Macedonia, Mauritius, Montenegro, Senegal, South Korea, Turkey, Uruguay, and Zambia** emphasized the continuing challenges in addressing the needs of the most vulnerable groups and ensuring their integration in MDG efforts. **Norway** and **Rwanda** noted the role of women's empowerment as a catalyst of change. Finally, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon stressed that inequality undermines social cohesion even in countries that register substantial MDG progress.

## 3. Participation of AI's SG and UN HCHR in Summit Roundtables

On 22 September 2010, AI's Secretary General Salil Shetty participated in an MDG Summit roundtable on *Widening and Strengthening Partnerships*. Also on 22 September, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Ms. Navi Pillay, participated in a Summit roundtable on *Addressing the Needs of the Most Vulnerable*.

## II. Involvement of AI Sections/Structures

A total of 50 AI Sections/Structures engaged in lobbying and campaigning on the MDGs. Twenty-nine AI Sections/Structures met with government officials in capital at least once to discuss MDGs and human rights. Forty-three AI Sections/Structures sent lobby letters and/or AI's publication on MDGs, *From Promises to Delivery*, to relevant ministries and departments. Thirty-one AI Sections/Structures engaged in petitions and public actions to raise awareness about the MDGs and human rights. Fifteen AI Sections/Structures participated in or provided input to NGO-hosted public forums or government-held consultations on the MDGs. See Annex C for a full list of AI Sections/Structures. For more information on Sections/Structures' lobbying and campaigning, see MDG Lobby Chart, last updated on 6 October 2010.

## III. AI Lobbying at UN Headquarters

Given the relatively recent start of the Demand Dignity campaign and AI's work on the MDGs, AI's initial focus was on (a) building new contacts within the UN system and among diplomatic Missions, particularly those working on development issues (e.g. in UNDP and the Second Committee of the UN General Assembly); and (b) raising AI's profile on poverty- and MDG-related issues through the dissemination of AI materials including the *Half-hearted Half Measures* report published in May 2009.

On 15 October 2009, then AI Secretary General Irene Khan met with the UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon<sup>1</sup> and with UNDP Administrator Helen Clark to discuss AI's new Demand Dignity Campaign, the publication of *The Unheard Truth: Poverty and Human Rights*, and the need to incorporate human rights in the MDGs.

In April and May 2010 the AI UN New York Office staff and others from the International Secretariat increased their lobbying on MDGs, meeting with Ambassadors and experts from 32 UN Missions. Twenty-three of these were delegations of countries with AI Sections/Structures: **Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Finland, Japan, Malaysia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Senegal, Slovakia, Spain, South Africa, South Korea, Switzerland, Uruguay, and USA**, as well as the **European Union**. The remaining nine countries included: **Brazil, Egypt, India, Guatemala, Libya, Liechtenstein, Maldives, Nigeria, and Tanzania**.

In addition, the AI UN NY Office met with several UN officials to discuss MDGs. Among these were:

- Robert Orr, Assistant Secretary-General for Policy Coordination and Strategic Planning;
- Nikhil Seth, Director, Office for ECOSOC Support and Coordination at UN-DESA;
- Gary Conille, Team Leader, MDG Support Team/Poverty Group, Bureau for Development Policy, UNDP;
- Paul Ladd, Acting Team Leader, MDG Support Team/Poverty Group, Bureau for Development Policy, UNDP;
- Julia Kercher Policy Analyst, Bureau for Development Policy, UNDP;
- Ban Ki-Moon, UN Secretary-General;

## IV. Collaboration with Realizing Rights

In collaboration with AI, Realizing Rights' President and former UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Mary Robinson led two meetings with Member States in 2009 and 2010 to identify possible allies in integrating human rights in the MDG Summit Outcome document. The first meeting took place on 12 June 2009 and was hosted by the Swiss Mission to the UN. European Union States, Tanzania, Australia and Turkey attended this meeting. The second meeting was on 30 November 2009. It was attended

---

<sup>1</sup> For a UN press release on the meeting, see:

<http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=32570&Cr=human+rights&Cr1=poverty&Kw1=irene+khan&Kw2=&Kw3=>

primarily by European Union and other European States as well as Brazil. Due to a clash with an urgent meeting at the UN, invited G77 States were unable to attend.

In addition to NGOs, a number of UN and government officials attended the AI-Realizing Rights Conference *Human Rights: Foundation for Progress on the MDGs* in June 2010. These included the Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights and other UN staff, the Independent Experts on Water and Sanitation and on Minorities, a member of the ESCR Committee, and representatives from 23 UN Missions and governments: **Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Finland, France, Guatemala, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Liberia, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Portugal, Russia, South Africa, Switzerland, and USA.**

#### V. New York Lobbying Timeline

- **28 May 2009** – Publication of AI’s campaign briefing on MDGs *Half-hearted Half Measures*.
- **12 June 2009** – Mary Robinson’s meeting with Member States.
- **15 October 2009** – Irene Khan’s meeting with the UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon and UNDP Administrator Helen Clark. Publication of Irene Khan’s book *The Unheard Truth: Poverty and Human Rights*.
- **30 November 2009** – Mary Robinson’s meeting with Member States.
- **January 2010** – drafting of UN Secretary-General’s Report *Keeping the Promise*; AIUNNY lobbying on the report.
- **26 February 2010** – Advanced edited version of UN Secretary-General’s Report *Keeping the Promise* was made available.
- **12 April 2010** – MDGs Campaign Organizer joined AI UN NY Office.
- **12-16 April 2010** – Polly Truscott (AI UN NY), David Petrasek, and Rajat Khosla (IS) lobbied UN Missions.
- **26-28 May 2010** – Polly Truscott (AI UN NY), David Petrasek, and Savio Carvalho (IS) lobbied UN Missions.
- **10 June 2010** – Realizing Rights Conference *Human Rights: Foundation for Progress on the MDGs* and launch of AI report on MDGs, *From Promises to Delivery*. Conference Communiqué (AI Index: IOR 41/016/2010).
- **14-15 June 2010** – Informal Civil Society Hearings on MDGs hosted by the UN General Assembly.
- **23 June 2010** – AI UN NY Office and GCAP met with UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon to present an open letter on MDGs. Polly Truscott of AI UN NY Office presented AI’s comments to the SG’s Joint Action Plan on Women’s and Children’s Health.
- **30 June 2010** – AI submitted comments to the UN Secretary-General’s Joint Action Plan on Women’s and Children’s Health.
- **22 September 2010** —AI’s Secretary General Salil Shetty represented AI at MDG Summit Roundtable on *Widening and Strengthening Partnerships*.

#### ANNEX A

#### AI views on MDG Summit Outcome (A/64/L.72).

##### Headline

**The Inaction Agenda:** World leaders failed to agree actions to uphold human rights and ensure that the MDGs reach the poorest and most disadvantaged people in the world.

1. The Summit Outcome document does not identify the concrete steps that governments will take to address discrimination, exclusion, and the specific barriers many groups face in accessing basic services, even though there is overwhelming evidence that this is why the poorest people in the world are being left out of progress on the MDGs
2. No real accountability or monitoring mechanism was identified to ensure that commitments made at the Summit are met and that future efforts are consistent with human rights obligations. In effect, world leaders are saying 'Trust Us'.
3. Sixty years since the UDHR, more than 40 years since the ICESCR, world leaders still fought over whether their legally binding obligations should even be referenced

**Why do we think the world leaders failed:**

- The negotiations on the outcome document demonstrated that governments still view their development commitments as disconnected from their obligations under international human rights law. The MDGs are in many cases the de facto framework within which governments fulfill their international human rights obligations on issues such as education, health, food etc.
- The Outcome document does not include any commitment by states to review their existing laws, policies and strategies aimed at meeting the MDGs to ensure that they are consistent with international human rights standards for all.
- The Outcome document does not ask governments to set and implement time-bound national targets to realize the rights to food, education, health, housing, water, work, sanitation, taking into account existing levels of progress and resources available.
- The Outcome document doesn't sufficiently address the root causes for lack of MDG progress. There are no clear concrete measures, in the Action Agenda, to tackle discrimination and other barriers faced by excluded groups, across all the MDGs. For example the issue of unsafe abortion is left unaddressed, despite it being a leading cause to maternal deaths, as is the criminalization of abortion and emergency contraception.
- The recognition of the need to focus on the interlinked root causes of maternal mortality is extremely welcome. However, the outcome document has largely focused on health system centric responses to this problem. Other vital aspects such as how legal, cultural and other barriers impede women's access to reproductive, sexual and maternal health care.
- Despite the fact that the numbers of people living in inadequate housing and living conditions (in slums) is growing enormously, besides a weak reference to working beyond the global targets, governments were not called to set relevant national targets on slums. The outcome did not identify many of the crucial steps that should be taken to address the situation of people living in, such as providing people with a minimum degree of security of tenure and protection from forced evictions, though this undermines fulfillment of all the MDGs
- The outcome document continues to refer to cities without slums and to reducing slum populations, despite the clear risks that this may encourage more mass evictions of people living in slums, which often occur without safeguards to prevent forced evictions
- No actions are set out to address some of the key forms of discrimination for example, discrimination faced by minorities and people with disabilities, despite the evidence that minorities and people with disabilities have much more limited or no access to public programs and services in many countries
- Though there is a recognition of the need to respect the rights of Indigenous Peoples, the Summit did not identify the actions governments would take to do so, despite the evidence from the UN that Indigenous Peoples are disproportionately represented amongst people living in poverty and extreme poverty, their levels of access to health and education are well below national averages and they are especially vulnerable to the consequences of environmental degradation.

- The Outcome document fails to commit states to ensure effective national and international mechanisms to ensure enforcement of international human rights obligations in MDG efforts.
- The outcome document is silent on the role that courts, regulatory bodies and national human rights institutions can play.
- At the international level, the ECOSOC Development Cooperation Forum and the Annual Ministerial Review have been identified as the bodies, which will monitor progress on the MDGs. They are ill-equipped to monitor the compliance with states' human rights obligations, it is also a voluntary rather than mandatory reporting process. Only seven countries chose to give presentations on their progress towards meeting the MDGs to the ECOSOC Annual Ministerial Review in 2009. Similarly, the annual review process to be provided by the General Assembly is unlikely to incorporate a human rights focus.
- The Outcome document does not address the need to ensure freedom of expression, association and assembly, nor to the need to promote and protect the rights of human rights defenders. It does not refer to the right to information.
- The Secretary-General's Global Strategy for Women's and Children's Health, which is welcomed in the Outcome document, requests the World Health Organization *to determine a process* for global reporting, oversight, and accountability on women's and children's health. It does not provide any guidance on how this process will should include human rights dimensions.

**However, we can welcome the fact that the Outcome document:**

- Recognized that human rights are integral to effective implementation of the MDGs.
- Has placed emphasis on gender equality and women's full enjoyment of all human rights, and references to existing commitments to women's rights.
- Recognized the need for more efforts to reduce inequality and tackle exclusion and discrimination, and to promote universal access to public and social services.
- Recognized that full participation of all segments of society, including the poor and disadvantaged, in decision making processes can help achieve the MDGs.
- Made references to the importance of the rights to education, health and food.

**If they are serious about ensuring that the MDGs benefit those who are worst off, all governments can and must immediately take the following steps going forward:**

1. Ensure consistency with human rights standards
  - States must review their national policies and strategies for achieving the MDGs to reflect their human rights obligations, including by abolishing discriminatory laws and practices.
2. Fight exclusion and discrimination
  - States must ensure that their MDG efforts aim at addressing all forms of discrimination, prioritize all marginalized groups and implement their commitments towards gender equality.
3. Set and implement national targets for progress
  - States must set and implement time-bound national targets to realise all economic, social and cultural rights, beyond MDG targets, within the shortest possible time, on the basis of resources available nationally and international assistance.

4. Guarantee full and informed participation
  - o States must treat participation as a right, and not just a good practice, ensuring that people living in poverty are able to participate meaningfully in MDG planning, monitoring and implementation at all levels.
  
5. Strengthen national and international mechanisms for accountability
  - o Governments should ensure effective accountability mechanisms such as courts or regulatory bodies, are in place to hold them to account for their human rights obligations in their MDG efforts and to provide effective remedies for human rights violations.
  - o States should report on their national and international implementation of the MDGs in their reports to the Universal Periodic Review of the Human Rights Council and international human rights mechanisms.
  - o Any new MDG monitoring processes and accountability mechanisms should incorporate a human rights focus.
  
6. Align international cooperation with the realization of human rights
  - o Ensure that all international co-operation and assistance in support of the MDGs is consistent with human rights standards.

## ANNEX B

### AI Sections/Structures met with government officials at least once:

- |                |                    |                     |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| 1. AI EIO      | 11. AI Iceland     | 21. AI Slovenia     |
| 2. AI Austria  | 12. AI Ireland     | 22. AI Spain        |
| 3. AI Belgium  | 13. AI Italy       | 23. AI South Africa |
| 4. AI Canada   | 14. AI Mauritius   | 24. AI Sweden       |
| 5. AI Croatia  | 15. AI Netherlands | 25. AI Switzerland  |
| 6. AI Denmark  | 16. AI Norway      | 26. AI Togo         |
| 7. AI Finland  | 17. AI Philippines | 27. AI UK           |
| 8. AI France   | 18. AI Poland      | 28. AI Uruguay      |
| 9. AI Germany  | 19. AI Senegal     | 29. AI USA          |
| 10. AI Hungary | 20. AI Slovakia    |                     |

AI Sections/Structures sent lobby letters or AI's publication, *From Promises to Delivery*, to government officials:

- |                       |                    |                     |
|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| 1. AI EIO             | 16. AI Hungary     | 31. AI Senegal      |
| 2. AI Argentina       | 17. AI Iceland     | 32. AI Sierra Leone |
| 3. AI Austria         | 18. AI Ireland     | 33. AI Slovakia     |
| 4. AI Benin           | 19. AI Italy       | 34. AI Slovenia     |
| 5. AI Belgium         | 20. AI Luxembourg  | 35. AI Spain        |
| 6. AI Burkina Faso    | 21. AI Mauritius   | 36. AI South Korea  |
| 7. AI Canada          | 22. AI Mexico      | 37. AI Sweden       |
| 8. AI Cote d'Ivoire   | 23. AI Nepal       | 38. AI Switzerland  |
| 9. AI Croatia         | 24. AI Netherlands | 39. AI Thailand     |
| 10. AI Czech Republic | 25. AI New Zealand | 40. AI Togo         |
| 11. AI Denmark        | 26. AI Norway      | 41. AI UK           |
| 12. AI Finland        | 27. AI Paraguay    | 42. AI Uruguay      |
| 13. AI France         | 28. AI Philippines | 43. AI USA          |
| 14. AI Ghana          | 29. AI Poland      | 44. AI Venezuela    |
| 15. AI Greece         | 30. AI Portugal    |                     |

AI Sections/Structures engaged in petitions and public actions on MDGs:

- |                    |                      |                    |
|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1. AI Australia    | 12. AI Luxembourg    | 23. AI Slovenia    |
| 2. AI Burkina Faso | 13. AI Mauritius     | 24. AI Spain       |
| 3. AI Canada       | 14. AI Mexico        | 25. AI South Korea |
| 4. AI Chile        | 15. AI Nepal         | 26. AI Switzerland |
| 5. AI Croatia      | 16. AI Netherlands   | 27. AI Thailand    |
| 6. AI Denmark      | 17. AI Paraguay      | 28. AI Togo        |
| 7. AI France       | 18. AI Peru          | 29. AI UK          |
| 8. AI Ghana        | 19. AI Philippines   | 30. AI Uruguay     |
| 9. AI Hungary      | 20. AI Portugal      | 31. AI USA         |
| 10. AI Ireland     | 21. AI Moscow Office |                    |
| 11. AI Italy       | 22. AI Sierra Leone  |                    |

Sections/Structures participated in or provided input to MDG public forums and consultations:

- |               |                   |                    |
|---------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 1. AI EIO     | 6. AI Ireland     | 11. AI Paraguay    |
| 2. AI Belgium | 7. AI Luxembourg  | 12. AI Philippines |
| 3. AI France  | 8. AI Mauritius   | 13. AI Poland      |
| 4. AI Ghana   | 9. AI Netherlands | 14. AI Switzerland |
| 5. AI Hungary | 10. AI Norway     | 15. AI UK          |

ANNEX C

Member States who referred to human rights in their high level statements during the MDG Summit:

- |                         |                            |                 |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Afghanistan          | 11. Bolivia                | 21. El Salvador |
| 2. Andorra              | 12. Bosnia and Herzegovina | 22. Estonia     |
| 3. Angola               | 13. Burkina Faso           | 23. Finland *   |
| 4. Antigua and Barbados | 14. China                  | 24. Gambia      |
| 5. Argentina            | 15. Congo                  | 25. Germany     |
| 6. Armenia              | 16. Costa Rica             | 26. Greece      |
| 7. Australia            | 17. Croatia                | 27. Guyana      |
| 8. Azerbaijan           | 18. Cuba                   | 28. Honduras    |
| 9. Belgium *            | 19. Czech Republic *       | 29. Holy See *  |
| 10. Belize              | 20. Denmark                | 30. Hungary     |
|                         |                            | 31. Iceland     |



- |                   |                        |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| 32. Iran          | 54. Samoa *            |
| 33. Ireland       | 55. St Kitts and Nevis |
| 34. Italy         | 56. Slovakia           |
| 35. Kazakhstan    | 57. Slovenia           |
| 36. Kuwait        | 58. South Africa       |
| 37. Latvia *      | 59. Sudan              |
| 38. Libya         | 60. Suriname           |
| 39. Liechtenstein | 61. Sweden             |
| 40. Lithuania *   | 62. Switzerland *      |
| 41. Luxembourg    | 63. United Kingdom     |
| 42. Maldives      | 64. USA                |
| 43. Mexico        | 65. Uzbekistan         |
| 44. Moldova *     | 66. Vanuatu            |
| 45. Morocco       | 67. Venezuela          |
| 46. Nepal         |                        |
| 47. Netherlands * |                        |
| 48. Nicaragua     |                        |
| 49. Niger         |                        |
| 50. Palestine     |                        |
| 51. Peru          |                        |
| 52. Qatar         |                        |
| 53. Romania       |                        |

Asterisks indicate States with particularly strong MDG Summit statements on human rights.