

SEMINAR ON THE INTEGRATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS INTO BUSINESS PRACTICE

Palais des Nations, United Nations, Geneva, 1 & 2 April 2009

Convened by the Swiss Government, the Novartis Foundation for Sustainable Development, the Business Leaders Initiative on Human Rights (BLIHR), the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Institute for Human Rights and Business

REPORT FROM THE MEETING Authored by the BLIHR Secretariat

Executive Summary

This report summarises the main outcomes of a meeting of practitioners in the field of business and human rights which focused on progress under the second pillar of the mandate of the United Nations Special Representative on Business and Human Rights, Professor John Ruggie; namely progress in developing tools and systems to help realise the “corporate responsibility to respect” human rights. The central proposition was that a series of principles might be developed in order to guide future development of such tools to ensure greater consistency and quality. In order to understand this, the meeting first took stock of developments so far and tabled a range of ‘live questions’ from the perspectives of the businesses experienced in using the tools, as well as from the perspectives of Government, Civil Society and Investors.

The following principles emerged from the two day meeting and are recommended for further analysis and consideration by the Special Representative as well as all those engaged in the field. The understanding was that approaches taken to realise the corporate responsibility to respect should:

- Ensure adequate transparency (balancing the benefits and constraints);
- Be grounded in a human rights approach (rights-based principles);
- Be practical and effective from a business perspective;
- Be able to demonstrate real impact on the ground;
- Ensure the engagement and participation of the rights-holders involved;
- Ensure sufficient accountability of the business and for the rights-holders concerned (through adequate consultation and effective grievance mechanisms for example).

Introduction

The seminar held on 1 & 2 April 2009 built on the work of the Business Leaders Initiative on Human Rights (BLIHR) and the mandate of the UN Special Representative on Business and Human Rights. In addition it drew on two ‘tools sessions’ convened by the International Finance Corporation, the Novartis Foundation for Sustainable Development and the UN Global Compact in 2006 and 2007. Specifically, this report reflects the objectives of the meeting to:

- Take stock of current practice regarding the responsibility to respect and human rights due diligence, with a focus on companies and on service/tool providers;

- Identify an initial list of 'live conversations/questions' in relation to integrating human rights into business that speakers and participants can build on, challenge, and explore in the meeting;
- Summarise the key messages coming out of the seminar and in particular the ideas around a set of principles for tools providers related to the corporate responsibility to respect;
- Raise the possibility of collaboration and co-ordination among those present to address the key questions/issues in the coming 24 months.

The meeting began on 1 April with a high-level panel to examine the policy framework approved by the Human Rights Council on business and human rights. During the opening sessions, the following speakers set out understandings of the corporate responsibility to respect:

- Ambassador Rudolf Knoblauch, Special Envoy for Human Rights, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Political Division IV, Berne
- Marcia Kran, Director of the Research and Right to Development Division, Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
- Mary Robinson, President, Realizing Rights: The Ethical Globalization Initiative & Honorary Chair, BLIHR
- Gerald Pachoud, Special Adviser to the Special Representative – the mandate of Professor John Ruggie, UN Special Representative on Business and Human Rights
- Ron Popper, Head of Corporate Responsibility, ABB
- Klaus Leisinger, President and CEO, The Novartis Foundation for Sustainable Development
- Professor Alan Miller, Chair, Scottish Human Rights Commission
- Ralf Heckner, Head of Human Rights Policy Section, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Political Division IV, Berne

The main themes emerging from this opening debate were the following:

- The relevance of the current economic crisis within the field of business and human rights and how it underlines more than ever the need for effective mechanisms to ensure the corporate responsibility to respect;
- The importance of leadership on human rights for demonstrating forward thinking during this period and reflecting humility from the private sector;
- The relevance of Article 28 of the Universal Declaration at this point in time and its recognition of the need for a social and international order where human rights can be fully realised;
- The particular challenge in situations where local law is in conflict with international standards, or in situations of conflict or poor governance;
- Recognition that there is a need for companies to better engage with Governments and for Governments to assist companies trying to push the business and human rights agenda;
- The understanding that human rights due diligence within the policy framework of protect, respect, remedy speaks to business across the board and represents the starting point, it does not represent a leadership standard for business but rather a benchmark for all the world's businesses;

- The recognition that tools are a key part of the corporate responsibility to respect and that an essential element is in the capacity building with key individuals in the business;
- The need for a better understanding of what is meant by the corporate responsibility to respect and the possibility of defining some common underpinning principles relating to the work of the UN Special Representative.

The following sections of the paper set the context within which the seminar took place by addressing the main thinking with regards to the corporate responsibility to respect and the potential for joint efforts from tools providers to convene around this principle.

Part One: Taking Stock

The Responsibility to Respect: Recognition that the corporate responsibility to respect human rights is now a widely accepted norm is reflected in the UN Human Rights Council's unanimous approval of the report from the UN Special Representative on Business and Human Rights (SRSG) in 2008, the UN Global Compact, and many corporate human rights policy statements. In his report, the SRSG outlines four components of the 'responsibility to respect' under the idea of human rights due diligence: policies, impact assessments, business integration and tracking performance¹. The report also sets out some initial process as well as substance principles to support the scoping of human rights due diligence².

Business practice: The past decade has seen substantial progress regarding business respect for human rights. The start of this is characterised by a handful of 1990s reports of human rights abuse by business, identification of unacceptable practices, substantial harm to brands/companies and a concurrent step-change in commitment and action. Embedded by the UN Global Compact, given energy by multi-stakeholder initiatives and urged forward by civil society leaders (e.g. the Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, Amnesty business groups, etc), the initial investments have multiplied, matured and deepened.

Jumping forward almost two decades, the 60th Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 2008 also saw a blooming and flourishing of action – over 200 companies having human rights policies; 4000 organisations committed to the UN Global Compact; the launch of the Global Network Initiative, a code of conduct to protect the right to free expression and privacy in the internet and telecommunications sector; national business projects/networks on human rights (such as Enterprises pour les Droits de l'Homme and the Dutch Global Compact human rights project); launch of innovative reports (e.g. *Human Rights Translated: A Business Reference Guide*³ and the *Human Rights Corporate Accountability Guide: From Law to Norms to Values*⁴); and a strong cross-sector community evidenced by the participation in the International Seminar on Business and Human Rights in Paris on 4 & 5 December.

At the same time, the responsibility to respect human rights requires more progress in at least four areas. First, a key question for many companies (and their critics) is that they simply do not know how they are impacting human rights through their own actions and relations. Companies commit to respect human rights (most notably through their own

¹ Note the SRSG Report of April 2008 also notes that providing access to remedy also forms part of the Corporate Responsibility to Respect.

² UN SRSG Report April 2008, Paragraphs 57 and 58: 57. If companies are to carry out due diligence, what is its scope? The process inevitably will be inductive and fact-based, but the principles guiding it can be stated succinctly. Companies should consider three sets of factors. The first is the country contexts in which their business activities take place, to highlight any specific human rights challenges they may pose. The second is what human rights impacts their own activities may have within that context - for example, in their capacity as producers, service providers, employers, and neighbours. The third is whether they might contribute to abuse through the relationships connected to their activities, such as with business partners, suppliers, State agencies, and other non-State actors. How far or how deep this process must go will depend on circumstances. 58. For the substantive content of the due diligence process, companies should look, at a minimum, to the international bill of human rights and the core conventions of the ILO, because the principles they embody comprise the benchmarks against which other social actors judge the human rights impacts of companies.

³ Launched in December 2008 by International Business Leaders Forum, Monash University (Castan Centre for Human Rights Law), United Nations OHCHR and the United Nations Global Compact)

⁴ By John Sherman and Chip Pitts; Launched by BLIHR and the Mossavar-Rahman Centre for Business and Government, Harvard Kennedy School of Government

policies or commitment to the UN Global Compact), but what systems do they have in place to know this with any degree of certainty? Companies have excellent information and assurance systems with regard to risk management and compliance, but their systems with respect to human rights and other value driven policies are underdeveloped, this is in part due to the lack of universal clarity on the human rights responsibilities of business. These factors have been a key thrust behind the evolution of many approaches including the *Danish Institute for Human Rights Compliance Assessment* and the *BLIHR Human Rights Matrix*.

Second, there is a gap between the broad recognition of the 'corporate responsibility to respect' and many daily business choices and actions; third, there is a gap between the level of awareness of key internal champions and that of the rest of the business; and fourth, there is a gap between recognition by a small group of enlightened companies - and that of the majority of the world's business community.

All of these gaps are being addressed and the purpose of logging them is not to be critical, trigger alarm or inspire defeatism. Nor is it to suggest that normative baselines are pointless (practice will only ever approximate or reflect guidance). The purpose of highlighting these gaps is to give importance and urgency to the strategies and investments of the Business and Human Rights Community in the coming few years.

Service/tools provision: As a consequence of the commitments by, expectations on and needs of the business community over the past decade, a 'market' for Business and Human Rights services has emerged. Service providers and projects (non-profit and for profit, public and private, individual and collaborative) have moved to fill this nascent market. Consultants with a plethora of skill-sets, professional training and experiences have been contracted and tools applied as practical responses to the need for companies to demonstrate that they are fulfilling the responsibility to respect human rights.

A handful of tools, guidance materials, training modules and frameworks now exist for companies seeking to integrate human rights into their business. The International Seminar on Business and Human Rights marking the 60th anniversary of the UDHR offered an opportunity for sharing, as have the previous 'tools sessions' including this seminar. The proliferation of these tools has been a huge contribution to the agenda and to companies seeking to learn about and operate within a human rights framework.

However, the take-up of these products appears to vary considerably, 'suffering' from the same gaps outlined above: commitment vs practice, usual suspects vs the rest of the world, theory vs practice. Added to this is the question of how experts and tools or approaches can offer aligned and complimentary guidance. Divergence and difference is not *per se* problematic as business leaders can be expected to 'vote with their resources' and so reward those that deliver most value, and thus support innovation. This fits with the statement in the SRSG report of April 2009 that the "the principles of human rights due diligence and its core elements should be internalized by all businesses, regardless of their nature or size. But the specific activities that companies must undertake to discharge this responsibility will vary in ways not yet fully understood." There is not one simple answer that will fit all situations. Nonetheless, conflicting (or even just divergent or mildly different) guidance and messages can reduce overall confidence in the body of guidance and the velocity of corporate action and progress globally.

An additional challenge is that civil society may expect business to fulfil the responsibility to respect in line with the principles associated with a human rights-based approach, such as transparency. But companies may be resistant to full disclosure with respect to their human rights due diligence, often due to legitimate confidentiality concerns.

Conclusion: It is fair to say that the rubric of *Human Rights due diligence* has begun to function as an 'anchor' around which companies, industry initiatives, business associations, code developers, investors, experts, tool developers and service providers are reviewing, and evolving, their activities. That being said, the anchor is not yet fixed and this provides an opportunity for the community (business, governments and civil society) looking at Business and Human Rights to support and inform the SRSG as he develops further recommendations.

The Geneva seminar on 1 & 2 April allowed participants to take stock of current practice and be bold in informing/deepening the overall policy framework on business and human rights. It was well positioned, coming after the completion of BLIHR and before the launch of ISO 26000, part-way into the SRSG's second mandate to

'operationalise' the Protect, Respect, Remedy framework and before the review of many other key elements of the agenda such as the IFC Performance Standards.

Part Two: 'Live' Questions

Below is a preliminary list of questions that individuals and organisations appear to be raising as they consider the corporate responsibility to respect human rights and the concept/practice of human rights due diligence. This is not an exhaustive list.

This list was carefully considered by participants and referred to as a framework for discussion several times during the seminar of 1 & 2 April.

- **Policies:** What are the processes and steps required to establish a public commitment and/or human rights policy? What is the role of self-assessments to support strategic choices and focus? What are the critical steps required once the commitment or policy is in place? Is it necessary for all companies to have a stand-alone human rights policy/commitment?
- **Impact Assessments (drivers, objectives and definition):** What are companies doing that may fit under, or overlap with, the rubric of 'Human Rights Impact Assessments'? When companies carry out such an assessment, what are the drivers and intended results? Are human rights impact assessments seen as one-off activities or some form of risk/opportunity management system? What tools are being used and how do companies select tools, frameworks and/or service providers? What are the challenges of applying tools in practice?
- **Integration (horizontal and vertical):** What are the steps to ensure 'horizontal' integration of human rights into business i.e. across business functions? What are the steps of 'vertical' integration i.e. from global corporate to country level, business unit, project, or facility?
- **Integration (culture and business systems):** What can be learned from Diversity, Ethics and Health and Safety when considering wide and full human rights integration into a company? What are the major leverage points that can catalyze systematic integration (e.g. a possible 'magic circle' of leaders within a company such as the CEO/CFO/General Counsel/Head of Human Resources, or key business processes such as business planning, capital allocation plans, Mergers and Acquisitions, procurement, risk management)? What governance arrangements can embed human rights into the business? Is the idea of 'governance gaps' when analyzing business commitments in relation to human rights helpful?
- **Dealing with dilemmas:** Where complexities and dilemmas exist (especially when operating in complex social, political, economic and ecological contexts), how does the due diligence framework help companies make choices? If it does not, are there baseline systems, methodologies, capabilities or engagements that companies should put in place? What do stakeholders expect of such efforts?
- **Tracking Performance:** What are the critical components of Tracking Performance (e.g. internal evaluations, auditing, assurance, reporting, etc)? What are companies currently doing to track their human rights performance? What are the challenges faced by companies in this area? What further help is needed?

Part Three: Questions and principles in relation to tools and service provision

In part one, a brief commentary was provided on the emergence of Business and Human Rights tools in the past years. Next to due credit being given to leaders in this field, the contribution to the wider community/world of tools and efforts beyond current clients is occasionally raised. Some questions worth considering are:

- Do market mechanisms meet, or perhaps under what conditions will market mechanisms meet, business needs and serve the wider public good?

- What level of disclosure, transparency and sharing should there be between tools providers to produce shared learning and develop best practice? Is there a space for cooperation among tool providers, e.g. through country risk assessments or on particular issues.
- When carrying out Human Rights due diligence (and delivering services/tools to support this), is there a need for a standard baseline of what companies should not do and what they should do? Are current interpretations of the international bill of rights, the ILO core conventions et al (and humanitarian law) aligned: What is the same, what is different and why?

As noted above, there are developing civil society expectations as to what human rights due diligence might mean. Highly relevant to this point is the work of the SRSR team with regards non-judicial grievance mechanisms setting out principles to guide and evaluate the effectiveness of corporate efforts/systems in this area.⁵ Another relevant piece of work is the report by AIM for Human Rights, *Guide to Corporate Human Rights Impact Assessment Tools*, published in January 2009. The Guide takes a reader through the basics of a Human Rights Impact Assessment (HRIA), supports the selection of appropriate tools⁶ and outlines ongoing challenges and opportunities in this area. Section 1.4 outlines some suggested 'Guiding Principles' for a HRIA. These are:

- Human Rights-based approach
- Engagement and participation
- Transparency
- Balancing positive and negative impacts
- Internalising and Institutionalising

On 1 & 2 April there was agreement amongst participants at the seminar that there was a need to develop some principles as common criteria for tools providers to help companies realise their responsibility to respect human rights. The initial ideas accompanying these draft principles are set out below:

Transparency

A discussion ensued during the seminar as to the benefits and risks of transparency. Transparency in this regard referred to both the process undertaken and the results achieved. The example of BP sharing a summary of its impact assessment was quoted. Additionally, ideas were discussed as to the need for companies to be transparent in a way which does not provoke increased risks of litigation. Further research is underway to develop these ideas.

Grounded in a human rights approach

All tools should apply international human rights standards and highlight both the reputational risk element but also the need for business to take positive action to address social inequities. In the context of Human Rights Impact

⁵ UN SRSR Report April 2008, Paragraph 92. Non-judicial mechanisms to address alleged breaches of human rights standards should meet certain principles to be credible and effective. Based on a year of multi-stakeholder and bilateral consultations related to the mandate, the Special Representative believes that, at a minimum, such mechanisms must be: (a) Legitimate: a mechanism must have clear, transparent and sufficiently independent governance structures to ensure that no party to a particular grievance process can interfere with the fair conduct of that process; (b) Accessible: a mechanism must be publicized to those who may wish to access it and provide adequate assistance for aggrieved parties who may face barriers to access, including language, literacy, awareness, finance, distance, or fear of reprisal; (c) Predictable: a mechanism must provide a clear and known procedure with a time frame for each stage and clarity on the types of process and outcome it can (and cannot) offer, as well as a means of monitoring the implementation of any outcome; (d) Equitable: a mechanism must ensure that aggrieved parties have reasonable access to sources of information, advice and expertise necessary to engage in a grievance process on fair and equitable terms; (e) Rights-compatible: a mechanism must ensure that its outcomes and remedies accord with internationally recognized human rights standards; (f) Transparent: a mechanism must provide sufficient transparency of process and outcome to meet the public interest concerns at stake and should presume transparency wherever possible; non-State mechanisms in particular should be transparent about the receipt of complaints and the key elements of their outcomes.

⁶ Tools mapped in the report are Conflict Sensitive Business Practices (IA); Guide to Human Rights Impact Assessment and Management (IBLF/IFC/UNGC; Human Rights Compliance Assessment (DIHR); Community Human Rights Impact Assessment (R&D); Human Rights Risk tools (Maplecroft)

Assessments, there was a discussion regarding the difference in scope and depth between a full assessment which captures the subtleties of actual human rights dilemmas and a 'readiness assessment' which would be a much lighter exercise. The role of National Human Rights Institutions was also highlighted here as a potential source of expertise.

Practical/Effective

Tools should aim to be practical and speak the language of business in order to be effective. Additionally, they need to influence behaviour and deliver benefits to those companies that use them in practice, within the ultimate objective of preventing human rights violations. It was noted during discussions that the catch-all term of 'tools' could be unpacked to define the various elements with greater specificity.

Impact

A majority of the discussion focused upon the need for a tool to have actual impact 'on the ground', for it to go to the core of the issue and engage staff globally. Linked to this was the idea of a community of people who are able to use the tools in a practical way and share their experience with others. The context for this discussion was a wider conversation on the negative and positive impacts company operations can have and the contributions companies can make to development.

Engagement and participation

The involvement of a wide range of stakeholders or 'rights holders' was highlighted, in particular the need to engage with the people potentially affected by the business. The risk of discrimination or exclusion was also highlighted.

Accountability

The need for tools to contain a grievance procedure or to make reference to an existing one which complies with the proposed principles for non-judicial grievance mechanisms was also identified.

There was agreement at the seminar that it would be helpful to further explore these questions and issues through further consultation and that this paper would be shared with the Special Representative on Business and Human Rights.

Part Four: Conclusion

The final paragraph (paragraph 64) of the Corporate Responsibility to Respect section of the SRSG 2008 report reads:

'As companies adopt and refine due diligence practices, industry and multi-stakeholder initiatives can promote sharing of information, improvement of tools, and standardization of metrics. The Global Compact is well positioned to play such a role, enjoying a United Nations platform and reaching widely into the corporate community, including in developing countries'

In this spirit we conclude this paper with a list of possible actions and actors to move forward this debate.

UN Global Compact/BHRC:

- Possible development of a community of people who use the tools, including individuals within companies and practitioners to expand the group of experts beyond those present for this event and increase diverse geographic representation;
- Possible development of a HRIA commons, so that companies can refer to particular challenging dilemmas.

Tools providers:

- Share information relating to the grievance procedures within tools on the BASESwiki for grievance mechanisms;

- Sharing and co-evolving their work on an bi-annual basis – potentially using the Human Rights Working Group meetings as a forum for this;
- The recent virtual discussion group on Human Rights Impact Assessments hosted by the International Business Leaders Forum was an interesting example of collaboration by a variety of tools providers. More events such as this would be welcomed.

Companies:

- Sharing challenges and good practice in meeting/getting started with the corporate responsibility to respect, research on business culture/systems and human rights integration etc;
- Corporate lawyers in the field of business and human rights could gather together to work further to explore the litigation challenge in transparency.

National Human Rights Institutions:

- NHRI representatives could work further to compare base-lines based on the International Bill of Rights present in the tools for companies.

We welcome comments and reactions to this paper and in particular to the actions recommended. As an initial step this paper will be shared with all participants at the seminar for their thoughts with regard to the concrete actions in particular. Additionally, it will be presented to the Special Representative on Business and Human Rights.

We thank all participants at the Geneva Seminar on 1 & 2 April and look forward to continuing this debate and discussion.

AGENDA

INTEGRATING HUMAN RIGHTS INTO BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

1 APRIL 2009

16:00 Arrivals & Refreshments

16:30 Welcome & Overview

Ambassador Rudolf Knoblauch, Special Envoy for Human Rights, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Political Division IV, Berne and Marcia Kran, Director of the Research and Right to Development Division, Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights

16:45 **Keynote presentations on the conceptual framework for the Business Responsibility to Respect Human Rights with reference to the mandate of Professor John Ruggie, UN Special Representative on Business and Human Rights**

Chaired by Mary Robinson, President, Realizing Rights: The Ethical Globalization Initiative & Honorary Chair, BLIHR

- Gerald Pachoud, Special Adviser to the Special Representative – the mandate of Professor John Ruggie, UN Special Representative on Business and Human Rights

Responses:

- Ron Popper, Head of Corporate Responsibility, ABB
- Klaus Leisinger, President and CEO, The Novartis Foundation for Sustainable Development
- Professor Alan Miller, Chair, Scottish Human Rights Commission

Questions and discussion

Closing remarks and reflections:

- Ralf Heckner, Head of Human Rights Policy Section, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Political Division IV, Berne

18:15 **End of Session and Transfer to Reception Venue**

18:30 **Formal Drinks Reception**

19:30 **Formal Dinner | Global Trends on Business & Human Rights**

- Ambassador Rudolf Knoblauch, Special Envoy for Human Rights, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Political Division IV, Berne
- Christopher Goss, Head of Business Development: Oil, Gas, Mining and Chemicals, International Finance Corporation
- Chris Marsden, Vice-Chair, Institute for Human Rights and Business

21:30 **End of dinner**

INTEGRATING HUMAN RIGHTS INTO BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

2 APRIL 2009

What are companies currently doing to integrate human rights into their business? What are the main barriers? How far have we come in developing tools for integrating human rights into everyday practice? What are the expectations of other stakeholders? What more does the business community need (from peers, service/tool providers, SRSG, others)?

08:45 Arrivals & Refreshments

09:15 Welcome, Greetings, Agenda Overview And Framing, And Expectations Of The Day

Led by Nils Rosemann, Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Desk Human Security and Business and John Morrison, Director, BLIHR / Incoming Executive Director of the Institute for Human Rights and Business

09:30 Opening remarks

Christine Bader, Advisor to the UN Special Representative on Business and Human Rights on the Responsibility to Respect and Human Rights Due Diligence

09:45 SESSION ONE | RESPONSIBILITY TO RESPECT IN PRACTICE: REALITIES, CHALLENGES AND NEEDS

Chaired by Mark Hodge, Co-director, Global Business Initiative on Human Rights (in formation)

This session will be organized with reference to elements of the SRSG's concept of 'Human Rights Due Diligence': Policies, Human Rights Impact Assessments, Business Integration and Tracking Performance

- Ed Potter, Director, Global Workplace Rights, The Coca-Cola Company
- Soraya Ramoul, Advisor, Corporate Responsibility, Novo Nordisk
- York Lunau, Corporate Responsibility Adviser, Novartis Foundation for Sustainable Development
- Julie Vallat, Legal Counsel Compliance & Corporate Social Responsibility, Total

Discussion

11:15 Refreshments

11:45 SESSION TWO | STAKEHOLDER VIEWS

Chaired by Scott Jerbi, Realizing Rights: The Ethical Globalization Initiative/Institute for Human Rights and Business

What would stakeholders like to see companies do better and how? What are the key principles that should be developed as companies meet their responsibility to respect (especially regarding Human Rights Impact Assessments)?

- Nils Rosemann, Swiss Government
- Shanta Martin, Amnesty International
- Elizabeth Umlas, Independent Researcher

13:00 Lunch

14:00 SESSION THREE | IMPROVING SUPPORT/GUIDANCE TO COMPANIES

Chaired by John Morrison, Incoming Executive Director of the Institute for Human Rights and Business

This session will allow tools providers and thought leaders to have an open conversation about what they are all doing and could do better to serve the needs of the Business community and respond to the needs of stakeholders. This dialogue will start by each person answering the questions:

- What process principles inform our engagements with companies? What process principles inform the tools/approaches we develop? How do these relate to human rights principles?
 - What approaches do you take or advocate in establishing human rights baselines based on the International Bill of Rights and key human rights conventions? Do you think there is merit in a shared methodology or even an agreed baseline?
 - What support do you need to further develop your tools and approaches? Do you think that some collaboration/co-ordination among service and tools providers is desirable and possible?
- Margaret Jungk, Director, Human Rights and Business Department, Danish Institute for Human Rights
 - Mark Nordstrom, General Electric (BLIHR Guide and Matrix)
 - Lucy Amis, Responsible Business Solutions, International Business Leaders Forum (Human Rights Impact Assessment tool)
 - Kavita Chetty, Scottish Human Rights Commission (formerly of McGrigor Rights)
 - Amy Lehr, Foley Hoag

15:45 **Refreshments**

16:00 **SESSION FOUR | Recommendations and Commitments for the Business and Human Rights Community**

Chaired by Kathryn Dovey, Co-director, Global Business Initiative on Human Rights (in formation)

The Chair will open this discussion with key themes, insights and desired next steps in deepening the Responsibility to Respect in concept and practice. We will then ask Christine Bader (Mandate of SRSG) to share reflections on the day including a) what the SRSG may do to move items forward and b) what the mandate would support others do in the coming few years.

16:30 **Close**

PARTICIPANTS LIST

Ron	Popper	Head of Corporate Responsibility	ABB Asea Brown Boveri Ltd. GF-SA
Anders	Nordström	Sustainability Affairs Advisor	ABB, Asea Brown Boveri Ltd. Sweden
John	O'Reilly	Advisor	Advisor
Olga	Lenzen	Senior Project Officer	Aim for Human Rights, The Netherlands
Shanta	Martin	Senior Researcher/Advisor	Amnesty International
Danièle	Gosteli Hauser	Responsible for Business and Human Rights	Amnesty International, Swiss Action
Charlotte	Wolff	Corporate Responsibility	ArcelorMittal
Olivier	Loubiere	Corporate Business Ethics Advisor	AREVA
Philippa	Birtwell	Head of Public Issues	Barclays
Claire	Wallace-Jones	Director, Environmental Risk Policy Management	Barclays
Charis	Desinioti	Assistant	BLIHR / BHR Seminar
Amy	Lehr	Advisor/Attorney	BLIHR / Foley Hoag
Kathryn	Dovey	Programme Manager / Co-Director	BLIHR / Global Business Initiative on Human Rights
Mark	Hodge	Programme Manager / Co-Director	BLIHR / Global Business Initiative on Human Rights
Joanna	Clark	Co-ordinator / Researcher / Co-Director	BLIHR / Global Business Initiative on Human Rights / Work Ethics Ltd
Sune	Thorsen	Advisor / Attorney at Law	BLIHR / Global CSR
Salil	Tripathi	Advisor / Policy Director	BLIHR / Institute for Human Rights and Business
John	Morrison	Programme Director / Executive Director	BLIHR / Institute for Human Rights and Business / BLIHR
Laura	Underwood	Event Assistant	BLIHR / Work Ethics Ltd
Christopher	Avery	Director	Business & Human Resource Centre
Nicole	Weston	Research & Innovation	Business for Social Responsibility
Michael	Mann	Corporate Responsibility Manager	Cairn Energy
Jorge Daniel	Taillant	President	CEDHA-Argentina
Anthony	Jenkins	Technical Director	Credit 360
Fabian	Huwyler	Sustainability Officer	Crédit Suisse
Ronald	Nielsen	Consultant	Dalhousie University
Allan	Jorgensen	Human Rights Advisor	Danish institute for Human Rights
Margaret	Jungk	Director, The Human Rights and Business Project	Danish Institute for Human Rights
Domenica	di Donato	Sustainability Cross-cutting Projects Manager	ENI
Sabrina	Bosson	Assistant to the President	Fair Labor Association
Auret	van Heerden	President & CEO	Fair Labor Association
Robert	Corcoran	VP Corporate Citizenship	General Electric
Mark	Nordstrom	Attorney	General Electric
Prof. Andrew	Clapham	Director	Geneva Academy of International

John	Sherman	Senior Fellow	Humanitarian Law & Human Rights
Judy	Glazer	Director	Harvard Kennedy School
Barbara	Dubach	Head Social Responsibility & Sustainable Development Coordination	Hewlett-Packard Co. Holcim Group Support Ltd
Chris	Marsden	Chair	Institute for Human Rights and Business
David	Schilling	Program Director	Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility
Diana	Klein	Project Manager	International Alert
Lucy	Amis	Programme Manager Business	International Business Leaders Forum (IBLF)
Claude	Voillat	Economic Adviser	International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)
Christopher	Goss	Chief Investment Officer	International Finance Corporation
Stuart	Murray	Accountant	LMDB Accountants
Christine	Bader	Advisor	Mandate of UN SGSR Business and Human Rights
Gerald	Pachoud	Advisor	Mandate of UN SGSR Business and Human Rights
Catharina	Hempel Kipp	Ambassador	Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Sweden
Ian	Gearing	Corporate Responsibility Manager	National Grid plc
Christian	Frutiger	Public Affairs Manager	Nestle
Dorje	Mundle	Function Head	Novartis AG
Klaus	Leisinger	CEO & President	Novartis Foundation for Sustainable Development
York	Lunau	Corporate Responsibility Adviser	Novartis Foundation for Sustainable Development
Soraya	Ramoul	Corporate Responsibility Advisor	Novo Nordisk
Marcia	Kran	Director	OHCHR
Stefania	Tripodi	Business & Human Rights	OHCHR
Lene	Wendland	Adviser on Business and Human Rights	OHCHR
Mary	Robinson	President	Realizing Rights: The Ethical Globalization Initiative
Françoise	Torchiana	Conseil Juridique	Realizing Rights: The Ethical Globalization Initiative
Scott	Jerbi	Senior Advisor / Advisor to the Institute Board	Realizing Rights: The Ethical Globalization Initiative/Institute for Human Rights and Business
Sally	Britton	Director	Sally Britton Consulting
Kavita	Chetty	Lawyer	Scottish Human Rights Commission
Alan	Miller	Chair	Scottish Human Rights Commission
Bjorn	Edlund	EVP Communications	Shell
Elisabeth	Umlas	Independent Researcher	

Joe (Chip)	Pitts	Law Educator/Writer	Stanford University
Willy	Egset	CSR Manager	StatoilHydro
Mitra	Forouhar	Senior Advisor	StatoilHydro
Ralf	Heckner	Head of Section	Switzerland EDA
Rudolf	Knoblauch	Ambassador, Special Envoy for Human Rights	Switzerland EDA
Nils	Rosemann	Desk Officer	Switzerland EDA
Edward	Potter	Director, Global Workplace Rights	The Coca-Cola Company
Elise	More	Manager	The Walt Disney Company
Julie	Vallat	Legal Counsel Compliance & Corporate Social Responsibility	Total SA Corporate
Luke	Wilde	Director	TwentyFifty Ltd
Yann	Kermode	Risk Controller	UBS
Andrea	Shemberg	Legal Adviser	UN
David	Vermijs	Project Consultant	UN Global Compact Network of the Netherlands
Ursula	Wynhoven	Head, Policy and Legal	UN Global Compact Office