



# VALUING RESPECT

— BY **Shift** —

**First Round of Multi-Stakeholder Expert Conversations**  
London, July 10, 2018



## About Valuing Respect

**Valuing Respect** is a global collaborative platform, led by Shift, to research and co-create better ways of evaluating business respect for human rights. Our aim is to develop tools and insights that can help both companies and their stakeholders focus their resources on actions that effectively improve outcomes for people.

Learn more: [valuingrespect.org](http://valuingrespect.org)

## About Shift

Shift is the leading center of expertise on the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. Shift's global team facilitates dialogue, builds capacity and develops new approaches with companies, government, civil society organizations and international institutions to bring about a world in which business gets done with respect for people's fundamental welfare and dignity. Shift is a non-profit, mission-driven organization.

Visit: [shiftproject.org](http://shiftproject.org)      Follow us at [@shiftproject](https://twitter.com/shiftproject)

© Shift Project, Ltd. 2018



## 1. Objectives of the consultation

On July 10, 2018, Shift's Valuing Respect project team hosted a one-day multi-stakeholder expert consultation in London. This meeting provided the first opportunity for expert stakeholders in Europe to learn about the project and to:

- offer guidance on project objectives, focus areas and pitfalls to avoid;
- support the project team to understand the current state of practice – including challenges – with evaluating business respect for human rights;
- provide feedback on a proposed framework for approaching the evaluation of company progress and performance on human rights; and
- explore the potential to integrate rights-holder perspectives into evaluation, including via the use of technology.

## 2. About this report

This report is designed to record issues raised during the consultation. Throughout 2018, similar in-depth consultations are taking place, in London, Singapore and Johannesburg. Reports from these sessions will also be made available via the online project portal at [valuingrespect.org](http://valuingrespect.org). In late 2018, the project team will publish a key take-aways document to summarize the main points that emerged across the consultations and set out the ways in which they will shape the next stages of the project.

Annex A provides the agenda for the consultation.

Annex B provides the list of participants. The consultation involved individuals from across companies, nongovernmental organizations, investors and academia. All participants took part in their personal capacity and not on behalf of their organizations. Discussions were held under the Chatham House Rule in order to stimulate open and frank conversation. Accordingly, this summary reflects ideas expressed but does not attribute them to specific speakers.



## Session One: The Opportunity

The project team introduced the Valuing Respect platform. This included an overview of the current context that is driving more attention and effort into tracking the effectiveness of company effort to respect human rights, as well as an explanation of the three-year process of research, consultation and gradual crystallization of products and resources. Discussions highlighted a number of points:

**a. The aim should be to create methodologies, criteria, and tools more than a specific set of benchmarks and indicators.** Participants expressed that there is a gap in the landscape for guidance about how to arrive at, and then apply, a good set of indicators or “system of indicators”. The project should try to develop simple, local and practical guidelines for different actors, e.g. on how to develop indicators and indicator systems, frameworks, etc. This does not mean that the project should entirely avoid positing indicators that might have broad applicability across industry sectors and contexts. Rather, these should also be illustrative of a way of working, not a standalone proposal for replacing existing efforts.

**b. The project should empower those that are not currently empowered – both outside and within companies.** A number of participants noted that there may be an audience for the project that wants to assess, challenge and inform a company’s approach to respecting human rights, but are somewhat disempowered to do so. Examples provided were: human rights defenders, vulnerable workers, local communities and individuals within a company seeking more involvement in company decision-making.

The project team supported this ambition and shared the intent to support everyone to better evaluate business respect for human rights, regardless of stakeholder group. And broadly speaking, attention is being paid to two lenses: *the use of evaluation from inside a company and from outside a company*. These do overlap, but they are not the same, and the same information is not necessarily useful and meaningful for both.

**c. The team should consider how to directly involve communities, grass-roots organizations and affected workers in the process of the project:** A few individuals asked about the participation of affected stakeholders and local organizations in the project’s research and consultations. The project team reflected that this would be part of our expanded consultation schedule in the project’s second year, especially as we start to focus on specific issue areas. Further, the early research for the project includes a focus on how to integrate authentic rights-holder perspectives into evaluation of business respect for human rights. As such, future interviews and pilots will likely involve grass-roots organizations as partners/collaborators.

**d. There is interest to understand if the project will focus on specific industry sectors:** Participants noted that there may be value in focusing on products for specific sectors and also in drawing on their separate experience and knowledge. The project team reflected that this is already something they are



giving thought to, though the question is how to move into general learning from that specific expertise. The project team recognized this challenge, and said that the project may end up with a mix of outputs, some of them of cross-cutting application across sectors, and some focusing on specific sectors or stakeholders.

**e. There is an opportunity to reinforce the value and necessity for companies to respect human rights as a basis for contributing to the SDGs.** Some participants argued that the project should be mindful of the expected increase by business and others in investment into the SDGs. Can this project show how implementation of respect for human rights can actually be a contribution to good outcomes and not simply a “do no harm” activity?

**f. NGO campaigns could benefit from them the projects findings...as could banks.** A few individuals from civil society organizations noted that the recommendations they make to business in the context of campaigning and driving accountability can often be “hit or miss”. It would be very useful if this project could support NGOs to sort out which information is indicative of real progress. Others reflected that in some ways, banks and investors are in a similar position, so guidance about how to make meaningful recommendations / set expectations to clients would be useful.

**g. The development of metrics targeted at what drives practical change in the supply chain would be very useful.** Participants expressed that metrics currently used to assess the performance of a company regarding responsible supply chain management are heavily focused on inputs, activities and findings. How do we track what actually drives positive change and find indicators of those outcomes? An example shared was the use of worker turnover figures and related financial cost metrics, which can also be an indicator of workplace culture. Some noted that another useful indicator may be the degree of partnership and positive engagement between buyers and suppliers – instead of focusing on data and information going back and forth in a purely transactional relationship.

**h. More data about the business could drive markets to incentivize respect for human rights.** Some participants held the view that the project should help bring out evidence of the business case for respect for human rights. This could be used within companies to get different departments to focus on respect for human rights. It could also be used by investors to have more informed conversations with companies. Importantly, this should be about the value that is at stake and not just value destruction but also value protection and creation.

A few participants also argued that the project should connect to discussions around existing accounting models and disciplines. Should we pursue a separate financial/accounting language for non-financial issues, or try to build bridges to conventional thinking? Some saw an opportunity to connect into what we already measure that informs investment decisions (e.g. contingent liabilities; cost of sale; financial ratio analysis).



**i. We need more focus on information regarding failure, partial progress and next steps, not just positive outcomes or resolved issues.** Companies should feel comfortable disclosing if there was no progress / failure in one area, and not just celebrate where there is progress. The tone in current disclosure is too positive. It would be great if the project could establish – among all stakeholders – a more sophisticated understanding that progress in this area will take time and cannot quickly be finished and tucked away neatly. Evaluation should recognize change over time.

**j. Information flow within a company is a challenge.** In part due to organizational silos, and in part due to a lack of joined-up information management systems, it can be hard for different functions in a company to work together to track information, interpret data and make decisions. The lack of information flow can also lead to an incomplete picture of what is happening across the company in terms of addressing adverse impacts. Can the project address this in some way?

**k. This project feeds into the re-purposing of companies away from just making profit.** A number of participants suggested that the project should be framed in discussions and connected to initiatives focused on the role of business and capital in contributing to society – returning business to a purpose based in shared prosperity and security. Having better indicators and evidence that can support this move is also critical to rebuilding trust in global markets.

**l. There is a clear opportunity to scale up commitments and action to address precarious work and ensure decent work.** A few participants noted that it should be possible to gather data points about the business case for decent work, catalogue the incentives for behavior change and then focus on metrics and indicators that can spread good practice across the board, rather than being content with a few good examples.

**m. Can the project address, and support, laggards as well as leaders?** Some observed that a number of initiatives are targeted at companies that are more mature in their commitment and efforts to respect human rights. How might the outcomes and resources of the project be applied by companies that are not yet advanced? Is it feasible to address different levels in maturity as we think about indicators?

**n. We should be building evidence through field experiments, not just assuming that the dominant wisdom is correct.** The proposition was made that the project should learn from the field of behavioral science, which seeks to identify what policy and organizational interventions are actually leading to the desired behavior changes. Is it possible to run experiments that help us pin-point what is changing business practices and behaviors?

**o. Aligning the understanding and approach to measurement could go a long way to supporting more harmonization of initiatives.** A few participants noted that while the substance of what different ESG products and benchmarking initiatives are trying to measure has a lot in common, each



initiative/group is describing and defining measurement in different ways. It would be ideal if the project could help to create a common language and understanding to address this.

The closing parts of the session focused on what **pitfalls the project should avoid**. Participants tabled the following:

- Avoid anything that looks like a ranking because it can lead to companies being content if they score better than others – then they don't feel need to improve any more.
- Don't focus on principles that are too high-level, but rather on hands-on targets companies can drive towards.
- Do not develop yes/no principles to measure performance and progress.
- Don't try to be too clever and academic but stay practical.
- Accept that some aspects will never be measurable. That may change with innovation but the project should be prepared to take some aspects off table until we can measure them.
- Don't develop too sophisticated an indicator system. We should rather go to basics, involve practitioners and people on the ground.
- Do consider if certain structural and legal matters have any relationship to the effectiveness of a company's efforts to address human rights impacts. For example:
  - Size: None of the project's discussion papers refer to SME's
  - Location and local regulatory frameworks
  - Ownership: family-owned, cooperative, listed, State-owned

## Session Two: The Problem

In this session, participants worked in small break out groups to address the question ***What do you see as the gaps or challenges with how we currently evaluate business respect for human rights?*** The discussions identifying diverse views about the current state of practice in the use of indicators, metrics and information to evaluate business respect for human rights. In the second half of the session, the project team shared some headlines from their early research.

The following is a summary of the key themes from the discussion:

**a. Differences in internal vs external information.** Sometimes, the information that is most meaningful for people inside a company to know is not considered valuable for those outside the company. And vice-versa, requests for certain information from external actors is not considered relevant for people inside the company. How to address this gap?

**b. Indicators in combination.** It is rare that input and activity indicators are considered in unison with other indicators that look at results or outcomes. It is even more rare that all this is linked up with



contextual indicators such as local economic, political, social or cultural contexts.

**c. Targeting specific decisions and decision-makers.** We need to do a better job at identifying both: i) the decisions and decision-makers inside of companies that can determine (or strongly influence) business practices and outcomes for people: and b) the types of information and data they do, or should, pay attention to when making decisions.

**d. Measuring the positive contribution of a company.** For some areas, like diversity, wages in the supply chain, or health & safety, it is becoming possible to measure the positive societal contribution that comes from respecting human rights. But we need to do this in other areas of human rights. This can also support the fact that business respect for human rights is far from just 'doing no harm', and is critical to achieving the SDGs.

**e. Not enough attention to business models.** There can be a gap between how a company creates value for shareholders and customers, and its sustainability commitment. The latter does not necessarily address or align with critical core business activities (e.g. purchasing practices or public policy engagement). The project should look at business-model-related indicators.

**f. Measuring power dynamics:** There are evident power differentials in the relationships between companies and communities, or supervisors and workers. Where imbalance and inequality of power exists, this can enable abuse. Are there relevant indicators that would look at the scale of inequality of power, and what could we deduce from them?

**g. The weight of commitments and language.** It is important not to discount policy commitments or ignore the potential importance of certain words that companies and their leaders use. The use of language can be a signifier of deeper issues.

### Early research findings: Highlights

During the session, the project team presented some of the early avenues of research and initial findings. The content shared included:

- Based on a detailed **review of approximately 2000 indicators across 12 ESG indices and benchmarks**, the project team found that the vast majority of: the “S” (social) indicators items concern human rights; questions related to inputs and activities with a focus on audit data, training, and words in a policy; and the questions asked by the ESG ratings are seeking quantitative data points, such as “Total number of” and “Amount spent on”. Further, separate research conducted at Harvard and MIT have shown little correlation between even the most well-known indices.



- Based on research into the **disclosures of 130 companies across 7 different sectors**, the project team found that the dominant reported data points related to: H&S (fatalities, injuries); Diversity and inclusion; Audits/assessments; Training hours/numbers; and Complaints received/processed. The research did identify more nuanced and outcome-oriented data in areas of long-standing areas of expertise e.g. OHS in extractives; Privacy in ICT and Child labor in agriculture. Finally, good examples of case studies at farm/factory/site level with data that carries through from activities to outcomes for people.
- Based on **engagement with company practitioners**, the project team has identified interesting areas for future exploration such as: business leaders (formally or informally) tracking behavior changes following capacity-building; Innovations/pilots to assess outcomes on certain salient issues e.g. on livelihoods, living wage, women’s empowerment; attention given to *how* the measure is used (e.g. punitive v. problem-solving) and how this alters information flows; and a desire to get towards intangibles like ‘trust’.
- Based on a review of the latest literature **about using metrics to drive public policy and social change**, the project team identified key, proven, insights that we should keep in mind when evaluating business respect for human rights such as: What is *easy to* measure gets managed (and invested in); When a measure becomes a target, it ceases to be a good measure: “Uncertainty absorption”, when single clear metrics mask nuanced, judgment-based information; and that Indicator design is rarely (if ever) neutral.

### Session Three: The Approach

This session focused on the first discussion paper entitled *‘Evaluating business respect for human rights: Towards a shared way of thinking’*. This paper proposes both: the use of a Causal Pathway or Theory of Change model as a basis to approach evaluation; and the importance of also focusing on how key “organizational features” (such as governance, culture and the quality of relationships with affected stakeholders) drive or inhibit rights-respecting behaviors and outcomes.

An important and complementary framework was discussed with regard to the use of leading and lagging indicators, learning from experiences in workplace health and safety. A short discussion paper was circulated and presented at the meeting. Lagging indicators are essential to know what has worked and what hasn’t. They reflect outcomes. But looking at lagging indicators exclusively is like driving down the road using your rearview mirror only. They require root cause analysis in order to identify leading indicators that can help predict the likelihood of good or bad outcomes. Leading indicators are a canary in the coalmine and they enable organizations to take preventative action. While lagging indicators can be similar or the same across companies and industries, leading indicators need to be much more tailored to specific company contexts. They need to evolve over time as risks change and as company practices mature.



With regard to using the **causal pathway model**, the following points were raised and briefly discussed:

**a. Clarifying the purpose/use of the model.** Participants encouraged the project team to be clear about the intended use of the model because there are a number of applications / tools that use pathways. This clarity should include establishing that:

- It is a Theory of Change or Logical Framework model;
- The idea is to provide a framework to then conceive of indicators along the pathway as well as indicators in relation to assumptions / risks embedded in any theory of change;
- It is another way to think about leading and lagging indicators;

**b. Looking beyond outcomes for people.** There were diverse opinions about whether evaluation focused on business respect for human rights should go beyond outcomes for people. Some felt that it should not end / connect to outcomes for business as this might encourage business to not adopt mitigation and remediation actions that do not lead to business benefits. Others felt that the model should consider the wider societal impact over time, including with reference to the SDGs. Still others suggested that it would be appropriate to retain the language of “impact” when communicating about outcomes for people.

The project team recognized these risks / concerns, and also emphasized that the key will be to use models and wording that retain the focus and aim of respect for human rights on outcomes for affected rights-holders.

**c. Where does identifying potential and actual human rights impacts fit?** It was not clear to some where the aspect of identifying and assessing impacts (as part of human rights due diligence) connects to the causal pathway model outlined in the paper. The project team reflected that this clearly needs to be more explicit but shared that – in their view – there are two possible ways to think about this. First, that the model is focused on a company’s response to identified impacts and so the model assumes that impact identification has occurred. Second, one could see the process of impact identification as an activity that leads to new company knowledge about its human rights risks (an “output”). At such point, one might jump back up the pathway to assign resources and conduct activities as a response to the risk(s) identified.

**d. Alignment to social and human capital thinking and models.** The point was made that the model / diagram used in the discussion paper should be coherent with models and language from the field of environmental capital and social and human capital. The project team noted that they would follow up with relevant experts on the project’s International Advisory Group (such as from WBCSD and BASF) to look at this further.



**e. Inclusion of practices/behaviors in the model.** Participants welcomed the inclusion of a step in the causal pathway model focused on business practices and behaviors. However, there was some conversation about the challenges of: clearly defining the desired behaviors and practices; building the connection between a robust process or management system and practices/behaviors; and proving anything more than correlation between the practices and behaviors of a given company and outcomes for people.

**f. Systems thinking, feedback loops and boundaries.** A number of participants noted that a causal pathway model is a good starting point to develop indicators, and also suggested that the model in the paper is robust in how it distinguishes categories. At the same time, a few individuals raised that the diagram in the paper is a little simplistic because it does not reflect:

- the need to consider what/how other factors can influence outcomes i.e. the presence of other feedback loops and contextual factors beyond what is in the pathway
- the need to offer some boundaries about what a company can expect to influence.

**g. Limits of the model and other possible models.** Some participants advised that the project team should review and consider the limitations of Theory of Change or Log Frame models of evaluation. Some noted that development institutions are considering moving away from log frames in favor of other more organic evaluation methods that accompany a process along its evolution.

With regard to using the **organizational features**, the following points were raised and briefly discussed:

#### **h. On culture and governance**

- Culture is necessary but not sufficient to drive responsible and ethical behaviors, and in companies it rarely gets considered in the context of addressing adverse impacts on human rights.
- Culture is not homogenous in an organization. There are pockets of different cultures. National or other societal cultures are also a powerful influence on cultures in different parts of a multinational company.
- Culture can be difficult to measure: indicators on culture tend to be almost always lagging i.e. a bad or unethical behavior or breach identified after the fact.
- Culture is not only about what leaders pro-actively put in place but also about what you don't say or do about something (for example, in response to a crisis or bad event).



### **i. On business models and strategy**

- The case of Modern-Day Slavery is a good example of where business models and strategies to compete can carry inherent human rights risks. For example, the Core Coalition’s Beyond Compliance report identified a range of issues such as:
  - Subcontracting, complex supply chains (agency workers, outsourced/subcontracting workers); and
  - Downward pressures on costs: some particularly competitive industries, cutting costs is way to maintain profitability (including labor costs, exploitation, wage stagnation, unequal distribution of value)
  - Labor recruiters in supply chains, recruitment fees
  - Models that require high flexibility and low profit margin: rapid turnaround, strict timeframes

### **j. On quality of process**

- There was broad consensus that not all processes and management systems result in meaningful changes in day-to-day practices and behaviors. As such, simply focusing on the existence of a process is at best a distant leading indicator of better outcomes for people.
- Participants who regularly engage with companies noted that it should be feasible to identify a common set of indicators that processes will lead to the right actions. Examples shared included:
  - The presence or absence of interdepartmental processes to enable a coherent approach across the company’s practices.
  - Where a good social auditing system is in place, but procurement teams and relationship owners are not themselves engaging suppliers on concrete corrective actions.
  - Whether key personnel who lead on human rights are, in fact, empowered with the necessary resources, access and influence.

## **Session Four: Innovations**

This session started with two presentations from participants about the inclusion of rights-holder perspectives and interests in evaluating business respect for human rights, and the different ways that technology can gather and deploy data in support of evaluation. Break-out discussions then explored the relationship between technologies and rights-holder perspectives.

General points from the presentations included the following:

- There are various initiatives underway to put worker and community voice at the core of evaluating risks (to people and the environment), and the effectiveness of responses. These



initiatives have a number of common hallmarks: empowering local people to help design the interventions, be part of processes that assess progress, and have a stake in their success; and local engagement wherever possible with business and government decision-makers.

- The initiatives being developed do not entirely discount the existing data-sets and indicators being used. Rather, they recognize that companies and investors find value in some of the information (for example, from certification schemes and audits) and aim to combine these with information about rights-holder perspectives.
- There are also challenges with all of these initiatives. They take considerable time (and often money) to get right, and involve a lot of capacity building among the participants. They require an investment in building trust to get all of the right actors to the table and in a safe space for open conversation and collaboration.
- It is important not to pretend that technology can solve every evaluation or measurement problem, and not to confuse the use of data with “big data” applications. There are actually few if any truly large data sets about business impacts on human rights. But technology can nevertheless be useful in this area.
- The key to deploying technology effectively is not to start from the perspective of what technology, data or algorithms could do, but to start by defining the problem that needs to be solved, and then see how technology can support a solution. This often leads to a lower-tech but more effective contribution than had been supposed.
- There are emerging models for enabling the development of tailored indicators at the local level with the involvement of affected communities, while generating data sets that can be compared by investors across locations. When local indicators are appropriate and agreed, then data flows more freely and honestly, and trend lines over time become comparable reference points of relative progress.

**Discussions** raised the following additional points:

**a. We must be thoughtful about the benefits and the risks to people and human rights that may flow from the use of technology to capture stakeholders’ voices.** Participants agreed that any use of technology to surface and amplify worker and community voices must not undermine the rights of workers to organize and bargain collectively, erode privacy or otherwise increase vulnerability.

Equally, some participants flagged that we should not discount how new technologies can support existing institutions (such as trade unions) to be more effective. The two are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

**b. It is critical to be clear about the purpose of any approach or tool.** The types of Innovations presented need to supplement and add value to what we already do. They are not the ‘be all and end all’. For example, analyzing large data sets can enable identification of patterns in abuse or trends over time.



But they do not necessarily offer insight into the nuances of practices and experiences at a given site, factory or farm.

**c. Perceptual data is not, per se, always useful in evaluation.** Participants with a strong evaluation background shared that they can be nervous about using this in evaluations as it's very sensitive to changes over time.

**d. The possibilities and limits of blockchain.** A number of participants raised whether blockchain technology might be a valuable tool for tracking authentic rights-holder experiences and perspectives. While various initiatives are underway to test its utility in this arena, participants agreed that there are fundamental questions about the quality, credibility and reliability of information that gets logged.

### **Closing Session: Reflections, Recommendations and Next Steps**

In the closing session, participants shared reflections, recommendations and any questions/concerns about the Valuing Respect project. Messages from participants included:

“We need to identify where this project can generalize versus be specific.”

“In order to focus we need to identify who the agents of change are, and how to support their decisions and behaviors.”

“Focusing on the assumptions level of the causal pathway model carries lots of potential, especially if the project can field test whether assumptions play out as expected in the real world.”

“It would be helpful to explore the issues discussed in the context of concrete cases.”

“There are many complex and interrelated challenges to this issue, so the project should pick and work on those that are easiest to fix, as this will reduce some of the noise around the project and enable experts to focus in on those highly specific areas.”

“Go back to problem statement – what is unique for this project vs what can be sliced off for others?”



## Annex A: Agenda

**830am Arrivals and light breakfast**

**9am Welcome, Objectives and Introductions**

**930am Session One: The Opportunity**

The session will start with a brief overview and discussion about the Valuing Respect Project. This is intended to help participants understand – and interrogate – what the project is seeking to do, and how. We will then invite dialogue around the following questions:

- What interests you about developing better ways to evaluate business respect for human rights?
- What would you/your organization like to see this project achieve?
- What pitfalls should we avoid?

**11am Break**

**1115am Session Two: The Problem**

A critical early step for the project is to establish a robust picture of existing shortfalls and challenges in using information, measurement and indicators in evaluating business respect for human rights. In this session, we will surface participants' viewpoints about the current state of practice, and share some early research findings from the project. Questions for discussion include:

- What is positive about the current state of practice regarding the evaluation of business respect for human rights? What is concerning or unhelpful?
- In your work, what are the challenges of designing good indicators and securing good evidence/data to support evaluation?

**1245pm Lunch**

**130pm Session Three: The Approach**

In this session, Shift would like to test some foundational ideas for how to (re)think about the evaluation of business respect for human rights. These ideas are set out in the first discussion paper for the project which is a pre-read for the meeting. It posits the possible



value of: a) causal pathway models and b) exploring a few key features of an organization such as organizational culture and the quality of company relationships with rights-holders. We will explore the following questions:

- Do these ways of thinking about evaluating business respect for human rights make sense? What resonates? What are the potential pitfalls?
- What experiences do participants have of applying causal pathway thinking, or evaluating culture, processes, or stakeholder relationships in a responsible business context?

**3pm**                    **Break**

**330pm**                **Session Four: Innovation, cross-pollination and collaboration**

Developing better ways to evaluate business respect for human rights will require learning from, and leveraging, developments and innovation in a range of disciplines and contexts – for example in the space of data analytics, non-financial accounting, and rights-holder’s voice. In this session, we will share the ways in which the project team already plans to do this, but crucially hear from participants about where they see exciting opportunities for innovation, cross-pollination and collaboration.

**5pm**                    **Session Five: Reflections, Recommendations and Next Steps**

**530pm**                **End**



## Annex B: Participants

- Ruben Zandvliet, ESE Risk Advisor, Sustainable Banking, ABN Amro
  - Peter Frankental, Business and Human Rights Program Director, Amnesty International
  - Mike Ashley, Non-Executive Director, Barclays
  - Luke Waldron, AVP Sustainability, Group Citizenship, Barclays
  - Christian Heller, Senior Manager Corporate Sustainability Strategy, BASF
  - Georgie Erangey, Founding Director, Brodie Partners
  - Phil Bloomer, Executive Director, Business and Human Rights Resource Centre
  - Marilyn Croser, Director, CORE
  - Dan Neal, Programme Director, Corporate Human Rights Benchmark
  - Ben Rutledge, Senior Advisor – UNGP's on Business & Human Rights, ETI
  - Svein Erik Stave, Senior Researcher, Global Studies, Fafo
  - Maddalena Neglia, Director, Globalisation and Human Rights Desk, FIDH
  - Katryn Wright, Director, Global Business Initiative on Human Rights
  - Hannah Clayton, Manager – Environmental Stewardship & Social Progress, ICMC
  - Luke Smitham, Project Manager, Impactt
  - Ken McPhail, Director Research, AMBS Business and Human Rights Catalyst, Manchester Business School
  - Wilhelm Mohm, Head of Sustainability Initiatives, Corporate Governance, Norges Bank Investment Management
  - Caroline Eriksen, Analyst, Human Rights, Norges Bank Investment Management
  - Kamil Zabielski, Head of Sustainability Team, Norwegian Export Credit Agency
  - Susanne Stormer, Vice President, Corporate Sustainability, Novo Nordisk
  - Cristina Tebar-Less, Head of Responsible Business Conduct Unit, Investment Division, OECD
  - Beata Faracik, President of the Board, Polish Institute for Human Rights
  - Bettina Reinboth, Head of Social Issues, PRI
  - Gunelie Winum, Senior Advisor, RBA -Responsible Business Advisors
  - Eleni Choidas, Senior EU Affairs Officer, Share Action
  - Sophia Murday, Partner, TMP Systems
  - Ben Bowie, Partner, TMP Systems
  - Stephen Russell, International Policy Officer, TUC
  - Ida Hyllested, Corporate Alliances Manager, UNICEF Global
- 
- Caroline Rees, President, Shift
  - Mairead Keigher, Reporting Programme Manager, Shift
  - Michelle Langlois, Reporting Program Advisor, Shift
  - Susannah McLaren, Advisor, Shift
  - Marie Von Falkenhausen, Shift / University of Goettingen, International Economic Law
  - Mark Hodge, Senior Associate, Shift



**Valuing Respect** is a global collaborative platform, led by Shift, to research and co-create better ways of evaluating business respect for human rights. Our aim is to develop tools and insights that can help both companies and their stakeholders focus their resources on actions that effectively improve outcomes for people.

© Shift Project, Ltd. 2018

[valuingrespect.org](http://valuingrespect.org)