

both their independent capacity to promote and protect human rights, and their capacity to enhance and extend the efforts of the HRO.

*Recommendation #74*

**It is recommended that all UN field operation personnel receive a minimum of one day training on the human rights facets of UN field operations. Operation components such as military, CIVPOL, or political affairs officers, with the potential to be more directly involved in UN human rights field activity, will need substantially more human rights training.**

In training human rights field partners, there are normally two broad types of training; recognition and reaction. The first, recognition training, is what to look for. For example, they need specific training so that they are aware of vulnerable sectors of the population such as the particular plight of the elderly, children, displaced persons, women, etc. Only with such recognition training will they really be able to effectively monitor for human rights violations. The second type of training, reaction training, is the broad rubric for setting the options on what they can do once they have identified human rights violations, and the relevant skills ranging from effective reporting to possible active intervention.

As a final note, the choice of individuals for a particular HRO, standby HRO rosters, standby military units, etc. will dictate where the training gaps are. Each training session needs to be customized to produce the required qualified individuals. However, "it should not be the function of training to replace what ought to have been minimum criteria for selection."<sup>232</sup> Also, it does not appear to be self-evident that training must be carried out by qualified trainers. The complexity of human rights invariably makes it imperative that trainers be human rights experts in their own right. However, there has been a tendency to confuse human rights expertise with the ability to teach. Teaching is a professional skill that can be taught, and professional human rights trainers are critical for effective training. This is particularly so when an audience such as military or political affairs officers harbour a degree of scepticism about the actionability of human rights.

The remaining question is, who should be responsible for carrying out such training, or ensuring that such training has taken place?

### **11.2.3 UN and national training**

Over the long term, the UN will increasingly have the capacity to provide a fair amount of the training necessary for HRO personnel and HRO field partners. However in the short to medium term, DPA, the HCHR, and other potential UN centres of responsibility for such training, lack sufficient resources to do so. This is not meant as a criticism, any more than it

---

<sup>232</sup> p.28, Kenney, *ibid.*