I think that if a country adopts a national strategy concerning the realization of one right in particular, and/or the adoption of a framework law relating to that right, that they should emphasize how other rights are not in stating this being comparatively neglected, and that perhaps due to the complexity of the situation, they must in one space focus on one set of related rights, but state as a goal that they are not neglecting others, and those will be addressed in a separate framework law due to an organization of addressing these related rights.

I think any adoption of a strategy and/or framework law concerning only one right should clearly state that they are doing so do to complexities and organizational reasons, and the need to focus on a related set of rights in a particular framework law. I think they should say that there is no worry of contradicting the idea of indivisibility interdependence, and equal importance of all human rights, and that the focus of this set of related rights will not neglect another set that will be addressed separtely in another framework law, so as to better organize it and simplify the complexity of addressing them.

Although I am currently studying my country's US Constitution (as a software engineer currently unemployed, but interested in human rights, both inside my own country, and others, with my husband being a British citizen), my only understanding about how my country addresses human rights is that the US Constitution is an on-going living document, and it changes over time when human rights are violated, such as in 1865 when slavery was abolished since it violated human rights, and when women received the right to vote, since to not allow it violated women's rights, etc. I'm not sure how they compare international treaties on human rights and I'm no expert in this area, having been entirely technically trained in education and work experience. I know they are supported and that people contribute and volunteer to support people in our country and others, but in terms of comparing law documents and how they rank at a domestic and international level, I'm no expert here, and would be guessing at it at best.

I personally operate such that if you find something that does not make common sense, you change it to solve the problem, whether it is at a domestic or international level, and never turn your head to your fellow man/women in need, if you are in a position to change the path forward in some positive and common sensible manner. So if there is ever a conflict between something addressed at a domestic level with something at an international level, you work to change the problem based on some common sense approach.