

## **Expert Meeting on “What Next for Business and Human Rights at the UN?” 4-5 July 2011, Geneva**

### **Background**

On 4-5 July 2011, the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES), the Institute for Human Rights and Business (IHRB), and the UN Office of High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) convened a two-day expert dialogue to reflect on future actions concerning the subject of business and human rights, both within the UN human rights system and beyond.

At its June 2011 session, the UN Human Rights Council unanimously adopted Guiding Principles for the implementation of the UN endorsed “Protect, Respect, Remedy” framework on business and human rights proposed by UN Special Representative (SRSG), John Ruggie. These Principles, as well as the decision by the Human Rights Council with respect to follow up to the SRSG mandate, will be key to further global, regional and national action on this important aspect of the human rights agenda.

The 4-5 July meeting, held under the Chatham House rule (see participants list attached), was intended as an early opportunity for a diverse group of individuals to reflect on possible next steps by relevant actors including governments, businesses, international organizations, trade unions, national human rights institutions and civil society to advance the business and human rights agenda in the time ahead. This report aims to capture the main issues raised during the discussions. It is by no means a comprehensive summary of the rich dialogue that took place.

### **DAY 1 – 4 July**

#### **Session 1 - Review of June 2011 Human Rights Council Session Decisions**

The opening session reflected on the business and human rights agenda after the completion of the six-year mandate of the UN Special Representative (SRSG), Professor John Ruggie, and the adoption in June 2011 by the UN Human Rights Council of Guiding Principles for the implementation of the UN Protect, Respect, Remedy framework on business and human rights. The unanimous endorsement by the Council of the Guiding Principles was a singular achievement and indication of growing consensus on the relevance of human rights to business operations globally. But the question of how best to ensure that the consensus that developed around this new UN framework leads to tangible changes on the part of all relevant actors, in particular governments and businesses now becomes even more urgent.

It was noted that some view the Guiding Principles as representing the status quo – a world where companies are encouraged, but not required by international law, to respect human rights. Others see the work of the past six years and the Council’s June decisions as providing the much needed authoritative normative and policy foundations upon which further progress can be made at national and global levels over the coming years. This session began to consider the implications of the Council’s

establishment of follow up mechanisms to the SRSG mandate, which involve the creation of a new expert Working Group and an annual multi-stakeholder forum. Both are intended to move the business and human rights agenda forward at the global level with a particular focus on dissemination and implementation of the Guiding Principles.

Participants agreed that the new mechanisms must do more than provide opportunities for further dialogue and that over the coming months all stakeholders should contribute to helping ensure these new UN processes are established so as to produce the greatest impact. That begins with the appointment of the Working Group in September 2011. Individuals appointed to serve on the Working Group will need to have strong expertise in human rights and a proven ability to engage with affected individuals and communities. Individuals with practical experience of integrating human rights principles into business operations at headquarters and throughout supply chains will also be critical to the group's success.

The critical role of OHCHR in the next phase was also discussed. It was noted that the High Commissioner had recently flagged on-going resource constraints facing her Office with many new mandates being established by governments without adequate funding to carry out the work. Given the enormity of business and human rights related challenges, OHCHR will need additional support to fulfil its role but will also need to prioritize key areas where it can most effectively assist and catalyse continuing actions at multiple levels.

Participants also reflected on areas where consensus around next steps was perhaps most fragile. For example, some governments had wanted follow up to the SRSG mandate to focus on the development of an international legal instrument applicable to corporations. Other actors had called for greater attention to specific instances of corporate abuses of human rights and a mandate that could undertake investigations and provide remedies for victims. It was noted that the follow up mandate agreed by the Human Rights Council would provide scope for country visits by the expert Working Group and for recommendations to states and other actors. Therefore, it was in many respects the decisions that will be taken by the Working Group on priority areas of work that will shape next steps.

Other participants noted that related developments such as the recently updated OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises provided new opportunities to address human rights abuses involving business enterprises at national level and to foster implementation of the UN framework. In this context it was also noted that UN human rights mechanisms, including treaty monitoring bodies such as the Committee on the Rights of the Child and the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights had begun their own initiatives to develop General Comments on private sector related issues and that these would also need support to be effective. It will be important for the new Working Group to develop effective cooperation with these and other key actors that can help improve corporate respect and state protection of human rights.

It was suggested that the UN system would not be the exclusive vehicle for integration of the Protect, Respect, Remedy framework at national level and within specific industry sectors. A range of other organizations including the International Finance Corporation (IFC) as well as regional bodies such as the European Commission will need to embrace and implement the Guiding Principles within their own areas of expertise and authority. The UN will, however, as guardian of human rights standards, have a vital coordination and interpretative role to play in the time ahead and will need to be effective at engaging and catalysing a wide range of actors. Some cautioned that a new "industry" of management consultants and others would seek to establish itself in order to meet the demand for assessments of

corporate policies and operations against the UN Guiding Principles. Ensuring that such assessments are consistent with UN endorsed quality criteria would appear to be another priority for further work.

## **Session 2 - Mainstreaming business related issues in the UN Human Rights System**

This session continued the conversation around next steps. With respect to dissemination and implementation of the Guiding Principles, it was agreed that OHCHR had a key role to play in working with UN human rights mechanisms and other actors to develop technical advice and support on how they should apply in particular contexts and with regard to particular rights. It was also noted that existing legal protection gaps, in particular with respect to business involvement in gross human rights abuses, required further work at the international level, which OHCHR would be best placed to advance in coordination with the new Working Group when established. The need to develop further legal research that looked at other areas of international law and liability, such as environmental law, and how these might influence further work on questions relating to business and human rights was also raised.

Participants discussed possible targets and success indicators over the next three to five years. Some stressed that ensuring that the Guiding Principles were taking hold and becoming part of the mainstream policy agenda, including as part of country work by OHCHR and other UN actors, embedded within key multi-stakeholder initiatives and industry sectors etc. were all key objectives to pursue. Measures of success might include examples of states having incorporated the Principles into national legislation as well enhanced monitoring of corporate actions against the Principles etc. The need to identify good practices by specific companies and industry sectors as well as clear incentives for companies to embrace the Guiding Principles was also stressed. In addition to identifying good practices, examples of corporations being held accountable for negative impacts on human rights abuses was viewed as being equally important.

Capacity and resource related challenges were discussed repeatedly during this session. In addition to OHCHR's own capacity constraints, developing country governments, National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs), small and medium size enterprises and other key actors all face challenges relating to lack of capacity and adequate resources including on issues relating to needed changes in legislation and policies as well as monitoring and enforcement mechanisms and basic awareness raising and training tools. Ideas proposed by the SRSB relating to a new independent fund that could support capacity building efforts by developing countries, NHRIs, and other actors were raised in this context. Models of multi-stakeholder fund in the area of health such as the GAVI Alliance were mentioned although it was noted that issues like child immunization were far less politically charged than those relating to the business and human rights agenda. It was less clear in this case whether governments, business, foundations or other donors would support a new funding mechanism. Some participants also raised concerns about potential conflicts of interest that may arise if private sector funding was linked to national capacity related efforts. The difficulty of ensuring firewalls to protect credibility and legitimacy of such initiatives was acknowledged.

Other participants pointed out that capacity related challenges were only part of the obstacles to implementation of the UN framework. Global economic imbalances within and between nations, the power of major corporations and industry sectors relative to some governments and the realities of corporate activities being carried out across a range of jurisdictions and legal regimes, all required further action as well.

Also with respect to the need for increased funding for UN work in this area, it was noted that when operating at the UN in New York and addressing budget related matters, governments tend not to allocate the resources needed to implement mandates they establish in other contexts, including in the Human Rights Council. It was stressed that the multiple state co-sponsors of the June 2011 Human Rights Council resolution on business and human rights have particular responsibilities to see to it that their delegations in New York are aware of and provide the resources necessary to implement the new mandate effectively, including adequate resources for OHCHR activities in this area.

Some participants also stressed that there was a need to prioritize communication strategies that would focus on dissemination of the Guiding Principles and technical support to business associations, industry sectors and other business groups. It was noted that a wide variety of tools for business audiences had been developed in recent years by the UN and other actors but that with the Guiding Principles now adopted there was a need to update and consolidate these and prioritize the development of information packages that managers could easily understand and use in their work. It was noted that OHCHR was developing a business guide with a particular focus on the corporate responsibility to respect human rights within the Guiding Principles that would hopefully provide the type of information that would be useful to individuals working within companies. It was stressed, however, that such a guide could not be the final word for companies as the Guiding Principles were themselves new and would require testing and interpretation over time. The UN Global Compact initiative, in particular its local networks around the world, were viewed by some participants as being an important bridge between the UN and the private sector and that more should be done to capacitate the networks to engage on human rights issues through use of the Guiding Principles and the Protect, Respect, Remedy framework.

### **Session 3 - Mainstreaming business related issues in the UN Human Rights System (continued)**

This session continued the theme of mainstreaming business and human rights issues throughout the wider UN system. The role of the International Labour Office (ILO) was discussed and the importance of ensuring that the ILO's own existing initiatives to support companies such as its Help Desk, and the relevance of the ILO Declaration on Multinational enterprises (MNEs) and other ILO standards to the UN Protect, Respect, Remedy framework were stressed. Close coordination between OHCHR, the new expert Working Group and the ILO and its key constituents needs to be maintained and further strengthened, in particular on issues that continue to be most challenging in some contexts such as freedom of association and collective bargaining rights, living wage, capacity for small and medium size enterprises etc. The need for these organizations to provide structured space for further dialogue and coordinated action was also noted.

The role of NHRIs was also discussed in this context. In 2010 the international conference of NHRIs in Edinburgh adopted a declaration in which they committed to scaling up their work relating to business and human rights. Regional meetings of NHRIs are being held during 2011 and 2012 to take this forward. There are a number of entry points for NHRIs to contribute to work in this area including by engaging directly on business related issues with relevant UN Treaty Bodies as they review country performance under the various international human rights instruments. The Danish Institute for Human Rights is leading efforts to develop tools to assist NHRIs in engaging with Treaty Bodies as well as the Human Rights Council's Universal Periodic Review process on business related issues. The need for practical tools that will assist NHRIs, which also face severe resource constraints of their own in many countries,

in working with their respective governments and other actors on business related challenges, was stressed.

The concept of peer review as a means of assessing progress in implementing the Guiding Principles was raised in this session as well. This could be organized, for example, around industry sectors, which could come together to compare practices and on-going challenges and to engage other actors in dialogue and constructive assessment of performance. It could also involve regional and cross-regional efforts by willing governments to discuss their own obligations under the UN framework and report on progress made and obstacles faced. The UN need not organize such initiatives but proactive leadership is needed to make these or other peer review processes successful. With respect to the importance of leadership, it was also noted that corporate leaders will be more likely to respond positively if consistent and frequent messages from government, UN and other leaders urge them to take the UN framework fully on board and that doing so is not only about doing the right thing but also protecting companies against reputational and legal risks.

Similarly, civil society organizations have an important role to play in engaging with the new Working Group in areas seen as being of particular relevance such as providing examples of on-going situations at country level where business involvement in human rights abuses is not being addressed adequately. It was stressed that a focus on such real life situations and improving protection of human rights at local and national level, including the need for effective remedies, would be valuable contributions to applying the UN framework in practice. It was also suggested that the Working Group would need support in a broad range of legal questions, for example, considering issues of impunity, and potential conflicts between private and public international law regimes. However, some participants stressed that it must also be noted that civil society in many countries continues to face enormous challenges relating to issues such as land acquisition involving business and may not view the UN framework as an adequate rallying point for their efforts. Engaging civil society at all levels and orienting its work towards those most in need should thus be another priority for the Working Group and the wider UN system.

This session concluded with reflections on other institutions as well as policy and legal areas that are of direct relevance to the UN framework. Examples include export credit agencies and the proliferation of bilateral trade and investment agreements. It was stressed that in many countries, governments are much more willing to support corporate positions relating to investment, for example, than to ensure protection of the rights of communities and indigenous peoples who may be negatively impacted by such agreements. While communities are told that such agreements are being entered into in order to promote development and generate employment opportunities, too often these benefits aren't realized for communities and other rights are violated in the rush to secure new investments in infrastructure, industries etc. The UN framework and Guiding Principles were seen as being a potentially important tool to bring governments, business and civil society together at national level to address such challenges. The importance of having UN actors, including those specifically addressing indigenous peoples' concerns such as the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues based in New York, directly involved to facilitate such processes was also noted.

## **Session 4- Business and Human Rights at the National level**

The aim of this session was to focus in more detail on how the UN framework could be embedded at national level. In addition to the role of OECD national contact points in addressing business and human rights issues, it was noted that the new ISO 26000 standard on social responsibility, though non-certifiable, was another important development that had significant implications at national level. This new standard, adopted in November 2010, is fully aligned with the UN framework and because of the familiarity of ISO to many industry sectors and governments around the world it is a potentially valuable entry point for dissemination and implementation of the Guiding Principles at national level.

The potential for NHRIs to build national momentum for implementation of the UN framework was also highlighted. NHRIs clearly have a mandate to examine existing state legislation against the Protect, Respect, Remedy framework and some are mandated to assess business performance directly. NHRIs also have an important role in monitoring whether governments are taking steps to investigate, punish and redress rights abuses involving business. They also should be involved in national efforts to disseminate the Guiding Principles and help organize training and other opportunities for dialogue around their implications at country level. Again, capacity constraints were flagged as being a key obstacle for NHRIs in fulfilling these objectives.

The discussion then turned to increasing attention at national, regional and global levels on corporate sustainability reporting, and the need to more effectively integrate human rights concerns within these developments. It was noted that a trend towards mandatory company reporting on social and environmental impacts is visible today in a number of countries but that multiple questions remain around the content of such reports, issues of materiality etc. At regional level, the European Commission is developing new standards on social and environmental reporting that are due to be released before the end of 2011. At international level, the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) continues to be a key framework and has increasingly engaged on human rights related issues.

Participants stressed the multiple issues that reporting raises including how best to measure integration of human rights concerns into reports, whether indicators can only demonstrate progress on process related matters or can also be developed to measure impacts. Some participants believe that corporate reports should reflect a company's understanding of actual and potential negative human rights impacts and what has been done to address them. Others stressed that more should be done to measure the "social footprint" – both positive and negative – of a company's activities throughout its operations and value chain. It was noted that there are some examples now of companies beginning to take more innovative approaches on reporting of this kind. Given the focus on human rights due diligence within the UN Guiding Principles, it was suggested that companies should be more transparent wherever possible on how they are developing such processes and integrating them within their existing environmental and social impact assessments. More transparency in this area could be seen as a preventive tool, providing protection for companies against human rights related litigation. The importance of engaging the investment community on these issues was also stressed.

Day one closed with recognition that given the multiple issues involved and limited capacities at present, the new UN Working Group on business and human rights would benefit from a series of briefings and recommendations prepared by a range of actors to inform their early thinking on how to prioritize their work. It was also felt that plans for the new UN annual forum on business and human rights that the Working Group will oversee would benefit from proposals for how it might be structured so as to be of maximum value to all involved.

## **DAY 2 - 5 July**

### **Session 1 – Reflections on Day 1**

This session began with reflections on day 1 of the meeting. A key short-term task for all concerned actors was to encourage a diverse group of individuals to submit their names during July as candidates for the new Working Group. It was also important to ensure that by the time the Group meets later in 2011 its members have the benefit of receiving background briefings from a range of perspectives on the substantive issues to be considered under the mandate. Longer term objectives such as developing future processes that deal with on-going protection gaps, encouraging formal and informal efforts to assess on-going efforts to apply the Protect, Respect, Remedy framework at national level and within industry sectors, and addressing capacity related challenges were all seen as being of importance.

There was also a brief exchange about the development of a business guide to the Guiding Principles that OHCHR plans to release in the coming months, which was mentioned during Day 1 discussions. Some participants expressed concern that because the guide was not part of the SRSG's final submission to the Human Rights Council, its release now, even by OHCHR, may in some ways undermine the Guiding Principles or limit the responsibilities of business in this regard. Some suggested a more consultative process in completing the guide to ensure that the final product was widely viewed as being legitimate. Participants were assured, however, that the guide was based fully on the consultative process that the SRSG had carried out during his mandate and would not be presented as a final, definitive interpretation of the corporate responsibility to respect human rights. Instead, it would be a compilation and elaboration of existing tools and guidance, presented in an authoritative form that would respond over the short and medium term to business requests for practical information with respect to their responsibilities under the UN framework.

### **Session 2 - Business and Human Rights Beyond the UN System**

The aim of this session was to consider how the UN framework applied to the growing number of corporate responsibility initiatives already in existence. It was noted that many of these initiatives have been discussed during Day 1 and that questions of coherence and connections between them had already been raised. What more could be done to "join the dots" between the many different approaches and initiatives? What more could be done to integrate the consensus on the Protect, Respect, Remedy framework into other relevant issue domains and what role might the new Working Group play in this respect?

Some participants suggested that one practical approach to enhancing coherence was to focus more on collecting experience of what works and what has not been successful in terms of raising corporate performance. Companies clearly would benefit from such stocktaking and could be directly involved in providing examples of initiatives for consideration. It was also suggested that steps to introduce the new Guiding Principles into a select number of existing strategic initiatives on issues such as anti-corruption or climate change, would be useful both in raising awareness but also in advancing the concept of policy coherence and the need for new forms of dialogue and learning across efforts all generally aimed at expanding good corporate and governance practices around the world. The importance of relying on existing platforms of engagement such as UN Global Compact local networks and the UN Principles for Responsible Investment were again highlighted although it was also stressed

that context matters and in some cases these would not be appropriate settings to address business and human rights relevant concerns or particularly egregious abuses.

In the view of some participants, a key challenge still to be addressed was to demonstrate how the Guiding Principles and human rights due diligence could be integrated effectively into existing management systems. In other words, expertise on how to operationalize the UN framework within existing corporate structures was seen as another key challenge requiring attention. The new Working Group would likely not be able to address this issue without expert support by individuals who had worked within companies.

In addition to engaging with existing multi-stakeholder initiatives, participants also highlighted the need to support local and national multi-stakeholder dialogue and mediation efforts. It was noted that in many countries it is difficult for civil society to engage business actors directly about specific concerns and governments are not always willing or able to play a constructive role. In too many cases, CSR is still viewed by business as comprising only philanthropic activities as opposed to policies and practices on a broad range of social and environmental impacts. The new Guiding Principles provide a valuable benchmark for engaging in dialogue but there is clearly a need for much greater capacity to organize multi-stakeholder initiatives that can be effective and take human rights concerns seriously. It was felt that the new UN Working Group had an important role to play in helping make the UN Protect, Respect, Remedy framework widely known and issuing specific recommendations based on country visits that could help in shaping the direction of future multi-stakeholder dialogue and engagement. The importance of the Working Group systematically involving where needed other specialists, such as ILO labour rights experts, was also stressed.

Other participants pointed out that multi-stakeholder initiatives do not currently exist in some key issue areas. Examples included labour rights abuses in the complex supply chains of some agricultural industries as well as efforts to trace products the sale of which contributes to fuelling violent conflict. It was noted that the OCED's new supply chain due diligence guidance was of potential help in such areas and that companies needed to work with all interested actors to draw lessons from similar experiences in other industry sectors and to experiment with new forms of cooperation, monitoring and reporting of impacts.

### **Session 3 – Conclusions and Looking Ahead**

The final session sought to bring together the multiple themes that had surfaced and suggest areas for further action by a range of actors, including in the short term the possible development of detailed briefings on specific subjects for the new Working Group as they begin their work later in 2011. Themes that were highlighted included:

- Strengthening on-going and future multi-stakeholder initiatives in particular on issues relating to supply chains, perhaps in part through development of model principles for the establishment and governance of such processes;
- Engaging business associations as well as associations of key actors within companies including corporate counsels, human resources, purchasing, business educators etc. on the Protect, Respect Remedy framework and Guiding Principles;
- Developing peer-to-peer review processes on progress in implementing the UN framework, both by governments and companies;



- Ensuring coherence of interpretation and approach to the Guiding Principles going forward, including through any new guidance materials developed, so as to build on the authority of the UN framework consensus;
- Ensuring human rights and business issues, and the UN framework are reflected in broader human rights implementation processes at UN, regional and national level (e.g. UN and regional treaty reporting, UPR, national monitoring and reporting processes on human rights and related areas including development);
- Developing innovative approaches to building capacity of diverse actors necessary to implement the Guiding Principles, including possible new funding mechanisms to support developing country governments, NHRIs and others;
- Disseminating and testing the Guiding Principles in local contexts and on specific, concrete dilemmas facing all relevant actors, including importance of the gender dimension;
- Enhancing access to remedies for victims of abuses and strengthening accountability at all levels where gaps remain, including through litigation strategies and broader commitment to addressing difficult issues often ignored by governments and businesses such as labour related rights.
- Strengthening the drive towards greater policy coherence by governments, and effectiveness of laws pertaining to business and human rights, perhaps in part through guides for states on how the UN framework applies on issues such as export credit and investment agreements, trade and development assistance among others.
- Developing proposals to ensure that the new multi-stakeholder forum established by the Human Rights Council, though viewed by some as having a narrow and weak mandate, is developed in ways that ensure it provides value for all concerned, including local communities, business representatives, governments, NHRIs and other actors.

In conclusion, the organizers thanked all participants for their active contributions to the discussion and for their valuable suggestions and insights. It was hoped that this early opportunity to reflect on the Human Rights Council's decisions concerning next steps on business and human rights within the UN system would stimulate further dialogue over the coming months as next steps in the establishment of the new Council mandate were implemented.

\*\*\*\*\*

## List of Participants

### Expert Meeting on “What Next for Business and Human Rights at the UN?”

4-5 July 2011, Château de Bossey, Geneva

	First Name	Last Name	Profession	Organization	Country	
1	Mr	Daniel	Baer	Deputy Assistant Secretary	Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor	USA
2	Mr	David	Boys	Utilities Officer	PSI Public Services International	France
3	Mr	Matthes	Buhbe	Director	FES Geneva	Switzerland
4	Ms	Frauke	Disselkötter	FES intern	FES Geneva	Switzerland
5	Mr	Christian	Frutiger	Public Affairs Manager	Nestlé	Switzerland
6	Mr	John	Grova	Associate Expert	OHCHR Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights	Switzerland
7	Mr	Christian	Heller	Sustainability Coordination	BASF	Germany
8	Ms	Cornelia	Heydenreich	Senior Advisor Corporate Accountability	Germanwatch	Germany

		<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Profession</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Country</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Mr</b>	<b>Scott</b>	<b>Jerbi</b>	Communications Director	IHRB Institute for Human Rights and Business	Switzerland
<b>10</b>	<b>Ms</b>	<b>Seema</b>	<b>Joshi</b>	Head of Business and Human Rights, Global Thematic Issues Programme	Amnesty International	United Kingdom
<b>11</b>	<b>Mr</b>	<b>Dwight</b>	<b>Justice</b>	Policy Adviser	ITUC International Trade Union Confederation	Belgium
<b>12</b>	<b>Mr</b>	<b>Tauno</b>	<b>Kaaria</b>	Consultant	Government of Finland	Finland
<b>13</b>	<b>Ms</b>	<b>Wambui</b>	<b>Kimathi</b>	Commissioner	KNCHR Kenya National Commission on Human Rights	Kenya
<b>14</b>	<b>Mr</b>	<b>Felix</b>	<b>Kirchmeier</b>	Senior Program Officer	FES Geneva	Switzerland
<b>15</b>	<b>Mr</b>	<b>Daniel</b>	<b>Kronen</b>	Corporate Legal and Compliance	Siemens	Germany
<b>16</b>	<b>Mr</b>	<b>Vijay</b>	<b>Kumar Nagaraj</b>	Executive Director	ICHRP International Council on Human Rights Policy	Switzerland
<b>17</b>	<b>Ms</b>	<b>Ricarda</b>	<b>McFalls</b>	Chief, Multinational Enterprises Programme	ILO International Labour Organization	Switzerland
<b>18</b>	<b>Ms</b>	<b>Myriam</b>	<b>Montrat</b>	Director General, Discrimination Prevention	CHRC Canadian Human Rights Commission	Canada

		First Name	Last Name	Profession	Organization	Country
19	Mr	John	Morrison	Executive Director	Institute for Human Rights and Business	United Kingdom
20	Ms	Dominique	Muller		Clean Clothes Campaign	Netherlands
21	Ms	Claire	O'Brien	Human Rights Adviser, Coordinator, ICC Working Group on Business and Human Rights	DIHR Danish Institute for Human Rights	Denmark
22	Mr	Austin	Onuoha	Consultant	CJP Center for Justice and Peacebuilding	Nigeria
23	Ms	Marietta	Paragas	CEO	Shontoug Foundation	Philippines
24	Mr	Ron	Popper	Head of Corporate Responsibility	ABB	Switzerland
25	Mr	Victor	Ricco	Program Coordinator Human Rights and Sustainable Development Program	CEDHA Centro de Derechos Humanos y Ambiente / Center for Human Rights and Environment	Argentina
26	Ms	Miriam	Saage- Maasz	Program Director	ECCHR European Center for Constitutional and Human Rights	Germany
27	Ms	Kelly	Scott	Programme Manager	IHRB Institute for Human Rights and Business	United Kingdom
28	Mr	Rodion	Sulyandziga	1 <sup>st</sup> Vice-President	RAIPON Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East	Russia

		First Name	Last Name	Profession	Organization	Country
29	Ms	Britta	Utz	Human Rights Coordinator	FES Berlin	Germany
30	Ms	Lene	Wendland	Adviser on Business and Human Rights	OHCHR Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights	Switzerland
31	Mr	Michael	Windfuhr	Deputy Director	GIHR German Institute for Human Rights	Germany
32	Ms	Lucinda	O'Hanlon	Special Procedures Division	OHCHR Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights	Switzerland
33	Mr	Ulrik	Halsteen	Human Rights & Social and Economic Issues Unit	OHCHR Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights	Switzerland
34	Mr	Sushil	Raj	Officer	OHCHR Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights	Switzerland
35	Mr	Yves	Lador	Permanent Representative to the UN in Geneva	Earthjustice	Switzerland
36	Ms	Emily	Sims	Senior Specialist, Multinational Enterprises Programme	ILO International Labour Organization	Switzerland
37	Ms	Githa	Roelans	Technical Specialist, Multinational Enterprises Programme	ILO International Labour Organization	Switzerland