Introduction

Recent decades have seen the growing involvement of private actors in the provision of services that are critical to the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights (ESCR), from education and health, to water and housing. A number of these services have often traditionally been delivered by the State and referred to as ‘public services’.

Although the involvement of private actors may play a positive role in certain cases, the increased privatisation of these ESCR-related services raises many human rights concerns. A range of human rights monitoring bodies have sounded the alarm in reports published over recent years, exposing human rights violations from States that result from private actors’ involvement in public services. Concerns raised include evidence that privatisation may lower the quality of and result in unequal access to services, increased inequalities, segregation, and the reinforcement of unbalanced power relations.

While it is becoming clear that human rights set limitations and conditions on the involvement of private actors in ESCR-related services, the question is whether human rights demand that certain services be delivered publicly. The issue is increasingly critical in light of rising inequalities and climate change. Developing quality accessible public services, like health or education, is a major condition to reduce inequalities. It could also play a central role both in preventing climate change (for instance, by having locally accessible services) and building a sustainable response to the effects of the ecological breakdown.

The COVID-19 pandemic and the social and economic crises it has triggered have further exposed and exacerbated the inequalities generated by privatisation and have confirmed the importance of the equalising and redistributive power of robust public services. This is a crucial time to explore and clarify the human rights position on ESCR.

This brief reviews the comments made by UN human rights monitoring bodies and experts about ESCR-related services (referred to in this paper as ‘UN statements’) and finds that there is a clear basis in the interpretation of existing human rights treaties to consider that States have an obligation to provide public services.

What is a public service?

Public services have commonly traditionally been conceived of as services that are owned, managed and delivered by the State.

A broader understanding than the State-focused paradigm posits that ‘public services’, from a human rights perspective, are services that are managed by the people, with the recognition of the State, in the interests of the people, and that they are not driven by any commercial or profit-making pursuit or purpose. This is for instance the definition proposed by the Guiding Principles on the human rights obligations of States to provide public education and to regulate private involvement in education adopted in 2019 (the Abidjan Principles). This broader conception of public would include, for example, a school established and run by parents and other community members in the interests of the children of the area that does not have any profit-seeking motive and that is recognised by the State as a public educational institution.
For example, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights’ (CESCR) 2018 recommendation to New Zealand indicates: “the Committee recommends that the State party...increase its investment in customary Māori [indigenous] public health systems...”

In all cases, however, the State remains the duty-bearer under human rights law.

Human rights require states to provide public services

UN Statements indicate that States are required as a matter of human rights law to directly provide public services or ensure their provision by a public body. Treaty bodies and Special Procedures appear to recognise this obligation both as a matter of principle (because human rights law require it) and in instrumental terms (because it is needed in order to realise human rights). Recommendations from the Human Rights Council’s peer-review mechanisms, the Universal Period Review (UPR), further suggest that States themselves recognise that human rights law requires the provision of public services.

(1) Direct recognition of an obligation to deliver public services

Human rights bodies and mechanisms have in a number of instances explicitly stated that States have an obligation to provide public services, both generally and in relation to specific ESCR. For example, the CESCR’s General Comment 24 indicates that “[t]he obligation to fulfil requires States parties... in certain cases, to directly provide goods and services essential to such enjoyment.” Similarly, the CESCR stated in General Comment 13 that “it is clear that article 13 regards States as having principal responsibility for the direct provision of education in most circumstances.” Both the CESCR and the Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC) have also in Concluding Observations (a set of recommendations to States about their implementation of human rights treaties) explicitly called for specific States to provide “public services”, “public health-care establishments”, a “public housing scheme” and a “public housing programme”.

The CESCR has further stated in four General Comments that, as part of their obligation to ensure access to services necessary for the realisation of ESCR, States are required to directly provide facilities or services to those with insufficient means to access them on the private market.

(2) Public services as essential for the realisation of ESCR

Human rights bodies and mechanisms have in many cases made an instrumental case for public services, regarding them as necessary for the realisation of ESCR, particularly, but not exclusively, for marginalised groups. For example, in its recent Statement on the coronavirus pandemic, the CESCR implied that the public provision of essential goods and services is necessary to ensure that those living in poverty are able to access such goods and services, in particular in times of crises:
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Inadequate public goods and social services also deepen global income and wealth inequalities. Those living in poverty cannot afford to purchase essential goods and services in the private market, and they bear the disproportionate burden of the economic consequences of quarantines, lockdowns and the adverse national and international economic situation.\textsuperscript{13}

The CESCR made a similar point in relation to gender equality in its 2016 statement on public debt and austerity measures, observing that “reductions in the levels of public services or the introduction of or increase in user fees in areas such as childcare, and preschool education, public utilities and family support services have a disproportionate impact on women, and thus may amount to a step backwards in terms of gender equality.”\textsuperscript{14}

Similar conclusions have been drawn in the context of State reviews. The CESCR expressed concern in 2014 “that the minimum essential levels of economic, social and cultural rights are not guaranteed in remote islands and areas in Papua and other parts of the country [of Indonesia], primarily due to unavailability and poor quality of public services, including in education and health.”\textsuperscript{15} In 2008, the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW)\textsuperscript{16} and UN Special Rapporteurs have also expressly stated within specific country reports that States must provide public services to ensure the realisation of the right to adequate housing\textsuperscript{17} and the rights to safe drinking water and sanitation.\textsuperscript{18} The CEDAW and the Working Group on the issue of discrimination against women in law and practice have called for States to provide “adequate public childcare” as one of the “essential services to encourage women’s economic participation”\textsuperscript{19} and as a means to ensure women’s employment.\textsuperscript{20}

3. States’ recognition that human rights require the provision of public services

A number of recommendations made by States to other States in the context of the UPR’s peer-review mechanisms reveal that States recognise that human rights law directly requires the provision of public services.\textsuperscript{21} Such recommendations can be found, for example, in the 2019 recommendations on Côte d’Ivoire, where four separate States - India, the State of Palestine, Ukraine and Algeria - explicitly called for Côte d’Ivoire to provide “free public education”\textsuperscript{22}

States also have referred to public services as a right in their UPR recommendations. For example, Norway recommended in 2017 that Indonesia “[e]nsure...that adherents of all faiths can fully enjoy their rights to health, education and other public services”.\textsuperscript{23}

Further evidence of State support for public services can also be found in State resolutions at the Human Rights Council, such as Guiding Principles on extreme poverty and human rights, submitted by the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights and adopted by the Human Rights Council without a vote. These are not part of the scope of this research however.

What good human rights-aligned public services look like

In addition to determining the basis for the obligation to have public services, UN human rights bodies and experts have commented extensively on how public services should be funded, owned, managed and delivered under human rights law. Taken together, these comments give rise to several human rights requirements for public services. Accordingly, public services must be:

1. **Accessible to all, without discrimination.** This is both with respect to particular groups such as women,\textsuperscript{24} persons with disabilities,\textsuperscript{25} older people,\textsuperscript{26} and persons who may have irregular migration status,\textsuperscript{27} and in general terms.\textsuperscript{28} It has been stressed that to ensure accessibility States must actively remove barriers (e.g. lack of documentation) so the most vulnerable or disadvantaged people can access existing services.\textsuperscript{29} It has further been noted that States should take effective measures to combat institutional stigma by public services providers to avoid discouraging access to services by certain groups such as sex workers, people living with HIV/AIDS, persons with disabilities and minority language groups.\textsuperscript{30}

2. **Responsive to the needs of those they serve and culturally appropriate.** UN statements have specifically recognised this requirement in relation to women\textsuperscript{31} and in relation to people living in poverty,\textsuperscript{32} and as part of a State obligation to reflect and promote the linguistic diversity existing within their territory.\textsuperscript{33} States are required to take measures to ensure that public education, public healthcare and public services generally are culturally appropriate or culturally adequate.\textsuperscript{34}

3. **Participatory.** UN treaty bodies and Special Procedures have indicated that States must ensure that vulnerable and disadvantaged groups such as persons with disabilities and indigenous peoples, are involved in the provision of public services,\textsuperscript{35} including by ensuring that such groups are represented and empowered in the design of and decision-making regarding public services.\textsuperscript{36} In the context of specific rights, the Special
Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples and the Special Rapporteur on the right to housing have emphasised that “residents of public housing should have direct, active and effective participation in the planning and decision-making processes affecting their access to housing.”

4. Of a sufficient quality. UN statements have on numerous occasions explicitly called on States to take measures to improve the quality of particular public services, including public health facilities, “food supplied through the public system”, and public education. Both the CESCR and the Special Rapporteur on the right to education have implied that States are required to take steps to ensure that public services are of a lesser quality than those provided through the private market. UN statements have on a number of occasions expressed concern about the low quality of public services essential to the realisation of ESCR.

5. Adequately funded. States are required to allocate sufficient funding to ensure the provision of quality public services. The CESCR, the CRC and the Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt have called on specific States to increase the State funding allocated to public services generally or to particular public services as a measure towards ensuring the fulfilment of ESCR. The CESCR emphasised the importance of adequate investment in public health systems in its Statement on the coronavirus pandemic earlier this year.

6. Transparent. UN statements have recommended that States take specific measures to ensure that public services are transparent. For example, the Guiding Principles on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights state that “States must provide accessible and culturally adequate information about all public services available to persons living in poverty and about their rights regarding these services.” In the same vein, the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights has stressed that States must ensure access to information regarding the quality of public services. The CERD, the CESCR and the Special Rapporteur on the right to housing as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living have also stated that States must ensure and make publicly visible clear criteria for the allocation of public housing.

7. Accountable. States are required to establish regulatory mechanisms or bodies to ensure the respect of human rights in public services, as for instance in the public health sector and the education sector.

Conclusion and recommendations

It appears from this research that there is solid evidence confirming that human rights law requires States to directly provide public services or ensure the provision of public services by a public body. UN human rights monitoring bodies and institutions not only regard public services as essential for the realisation of ESCR but also consider that, beyond any instrumental concerns, States have an obligation to ensure the provision of public services as a matter of principle. States themselves have recognised such an obligation through their comments at the UPR. More evidence could be found by examining other UN documents, such as Human Rights Council resolutions, and the positions taken by and within regional human rights mechanisms.

Strong, sustainable public services are crucial if we are to respond to the intersecting crises of rising inequalities, the ecological breakdown, and the economic and social consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic. The recognition of a State obligation to ensure the provision of public services under human rights law has the potential to be transformational in changing the tide of privatisation and its harmful consequences for human rights, and, crucially, offers another horizon of hope. As public services are inherently linked to human rights, they are not just a charitable option but are a component of human dignity, and are required to be provided by States as a matter of international human rights law. This has important implications in terms of changing the prevailing narrative on public services, mobilising social movements, and holding States accountable.
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