



VALUING RESPECT

— BY *Shift* —

Valuing Respect
First Round of Multi-Stakeholder Expert Consultations

Johannesburg, November 15, 2018



**Centre for
Human Rights**
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA



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

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

© Shift Project, Ltd. 2019

About the Centre for Human Rights

Recognized internationally for excellence in human rights law in Africa, the Centre for Human Rights is uniquely positioned as both an academic department and a non-governmental organization. A leader in human rights education in Africa, the Centre works towards a greater awareness of human rights, the wide dissemination of publications on human rights in Africa, and the improvement of the rights of women, people living with HIV, indigenous peoples, sexual minorities and other disadvantaged or marginalized persons or groups across the continent.

Visit: <http://www.chr.up.ac.za>



1. Objectives of the consultation

On November 15, 2018, the Valuing Respect project team hosted a one-day expert multi-stakeholder consultation in Johannesburg, South Africa. This meeting provided an opportunity for expert stakeholders to learn about the project and to:

- Share diverse perspectives about the current state of practice with regards to evaluating business respect for human rights and identifying meaningful quantitative and qualitative indicators to drive improvements and results.
- Test ideas for how to approach evaluation in the context of business efforts to embed respect for human rights in operations and value chains.
- Seek guidance from participants about what needs the project should seek to meet, potential products, resources and tools that could be delivered, as well as pitfalls to avoid.

2. About this report

This report is designed to record issues raised during the consultation. Throughout 2018, similar in-depth consultations took place in New York, London, and Singapore. Reports from these sessions will also be made available via the online project portal at www.valuingrespect.org. In early 2019, 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 provided an introduction to the Valuing Respect project. This included an overview of the current context that is driving more attention and effort into tracking the effectiveness of company efforts 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 importance and challenge of focusing on human rights as the frame of reference for the project. Participants were generally supportive that the project is focused on “business respect for human rights,” but some raised that human rights terminology can still be challenging for the business and other stakeholders.

This theme re-emerged throughout the day, with the recommendation that the project team should continually clarify what is meant by “business respect for human rights” in terms that diverse stakeholders can grasp. A few individuals raised that “social performance” might be a more digestible framing, while also being clear that the focus of this work is addressing impacts of business operations, products and services – not unrelated philanthropic investments. Others agreed that simply using the term “risks to people” gets to the root of what the *UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights* (UNGPs) are intended to address.

b. The project should support, not intimidate, companies that are just beginning to engage with the UNGPs. Some participants raised concerns that new frameworks and methodologies might deter companies from taking some of the initial steps towards embedding respect for human rights in their business. When we say that “we don’t really know what works,” we need to be clear that there is consensus about the fact that having a human rights policy commitment, understanding impacts and addressing grievances are necessary steps. The project should:

- enable companies that are less experienced in working with the UNGPs to use metrics and indicators to help them advance more effectively, even if they are just getting started;
- reinforce that the UNGPs already address tracking and use of indicators, and that this work is offering guidance on that specific aspect of business respect for human rights;
- deliver tools and ways of thinking that are very simple.

c. The project outcomes could support different stakeholders in different ways, and do more than inform company reporting: On the one hand, participants felt that the project could inform indicators and metrics that companies, and external reporting frameworks, use in disclosure. On the other hand, other important potential benefits might be:

- Supporting business leaders to use indicators to push internal change and improvement;



- Providing investors with guidance about what issues to engage company leaders on;
- Enabling civil society to better judge and assess corporate performance;
- Helping governments and ministries to understand and benchmark industry-wide performance.

d. Supporting the improvement of relationships between companies and communities is a priority in South Africa. A number of participants reinforced that it would be valuable for the project to offer insights about how to monitor, evaluate and improve company/community relationships, and a company's social license to operate.

e. Projects in South Africa often focus on mining and large-footprint operations, but the project should also address other industry contexts. Many participants would like to see the project, and discussions in South Africa, focus on human rights issues for workers in the supply chain, for consumers in retail, and in the financial sector. The project team supported this, and noted that the project is focused on a diversity of industries and challenges.

f. Participants suggested that the project should engage certain groups that can regularly be overlooked in such processes, but be very informative: Recognizing that diverse expertise and perspectives will be required to crowd-craft solutions that work for a diversity of actors, participants encouraged engagement with the following:

- Worker organizations;
- Organizations and individuals from Francophone African countries;
- Government representatives focused on trade, investment and responsible business;
- John Knox, Former UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights and the Environment.

Session Two: The Current State of Practice (in South Africa and Globally)

In this session, the project team provided an overview of early research findings that have explored the current use of indicators and metrics by companies and stakeholders to evaluate business respect for human rights. This research will be completed and made public in early 2019. Some headlines are provided in the box below. The discussion then addressed the following questions:

- 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?

Early Research Findings

The Centre for Human Rights presented initial findings from research into the human rights disclosures of the top 100 listed companies on the Johannesburg Stock Exchange. The aim of the research has been to identify the types of indicators that companies currently use to report on their human rights performance. The premise is that, while public reporting does not necessarily include all the indicators and data that a company may use to operationalize respect for human rights, reporting does offer a signal of the types of information that a company is using to track progress. Initial findings include:

- The majority of information provided is in the form of inputs, activities and to some degree outputs. Very rarely do disclosures track the entire causal connection from these to outcomes for people.
- The issues most frequently reported on were on Occupational Health & Safety, Diversity, Freedom of Association, and Child Labour. Beyond this, sector specific observations include:
 - Financial Services companies report on ESG screening by indicating numbers of investee companies that they screen. While some report on the performance of their investees directly, others simply refer readers to the investee companies.
 - Mining companies reporting on historic human rights issues, like progress in converting multiple occupant hostels into single rooms or family housing, featured fairly often. Several of the mining companies also provide updates on compensating workers suffering from silicosis, following the end of the class action suit against them.
- Training was an activity commonly reported, but there was scant detail on the content of such trainings, who was trained and any outcomes/ benefits that have arisen from such training. This was especially true of activities designated ‘human rights training’. References to training on health and safety frequently included number of trainees and some kind of outcome.
- While reporting on child labor featured about 12% of the time, most were simple statements to say no occurrence of child labor had been found. Companies whose sector had some agricultural component report a little more detail on child labor, specifying the number of audits / assessments of child labor in their operations and supply chains.
- With regards to grievances, companies often report on the number of grievances received and sometimes the number or % resolved. But there is limited data on feedback from affected parties about their satisfaction with the grievance process or resolution. Some positive outliers exist, where some companies (in the extractives industry) do provide information about affected stakeholder experiences.



Continued...

Other findings presented by the project team included:

- Based on a **detailed review of approximately 2,000 indicators across 12 ESG indices and benchmarks**, the project team found that the vast majority of the “S” (social) indicators items concern human rights. Of these, questions focus on inputs and activities, for example numbers of audits or trainings. Further, questions asked by some of the ESG ratings focus mainly on quantitative data points, such as “Total number of” and “Amount spent on”. Finally, separate research conducted at Harvard and MIT has shown little correlation between even the most well-known indices.
- 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.

The **pursuant discussion identified diverse views about the current state of practice in the use of indicators, metrics and information** to evaluate business respect for human rights. The following is a summary of the key themes from the discussion:

a. Participants supported that the project should not be about another set of reporting standards.

Following the discussion about company disclosures, participants sought clarity on whether the Valuing Respect project is trying to develop a new set of reporting indicators. The project team and partners then clarified that while the project outcomes might inform better use of indicators and metrics in reporting, the project is not about a new standard or benchmark.

b. Participants – from across stakeholder groups also reflected that the relatively mature regulatory disclosure requirements in South Africa can focus companies on human rights issues, though the data called for can be superficial. Broad-based Black Economic Empowerment reporting, Social and Labor Plans, and Corporate Governance (King reports) were offered as examples of how



mandatory reporting certainly increases disclosure on human rights and social issues in South Africa. However, even something as well-developed and nationally important as BBBEE, is largely focusing companies on collecting inputs, activities and outputs. Very little is monitored about the quality of empowerment and opportunities (especially for the poorest or least educated).

c. Part of the tracking challenge in South Africa stems from not focusing on the real or most important adverse impacts. It is important to recall that within the UNGPS, we want companies to track against human rights issues that are appropriate and relevant to their business. Participants from across stakeholder groups agreed that many companies may not even be focused on the right human rights issues. Some argued that even in the extractive industry, when companies report on company/ community relationships, protests, or strikes they offer quantitative information (e.g. numbers of days a strike lasted; numbers of people protesting; number of production days lost; number of complaints resolved) but without qualitative assessment and data.

d. It would be valuable to compare what gets reported/ tracked internally and the data shared in external reporting. Participants noted that companies certainly track information internally for their management purposes and often develop internal social risk and sustainability reporting. It may be that a more complete (even if not exhaustive) set of indicators are being tracked by companies internally, though not necessarily reported on to the public.

e. Business participants shared examples of some of the practical challenges of tracking and disclosing information regarding their own progress and performance related to human rights. Challenges shared included:

- Companies simply not being committed to open communication and transparency about challenges and risks. This can also lead to company reports being sanitized by communications or legal functions.
- Where human rights risks flow from the activities far away in the supply chain, getting meaningful and regular data about worker rights can be difficult. Sometimes, suppliers might be unwilling to share important information.
- Employees responsible for collecting and inputting data into public reports must be able to verify – via internal and external audit – that information is accurate. If information, such as claiming positive outcomes for workers in the supply chain, is not verifiable then employees will be reluctant to include this in external reporting.
- Lack of institutional systems to track information over long periods of time, compounded by personnel changes due to re-structuring or staff turnover.

f. Some of the most informative information can be difficult to track and requires innovation. Participants shared a number of examples of where innovation would be most useful for their own efforts to promote and embed respect for human rights. For example:



- Participants highlighted limitations of quantitative indicators in capturing relevant information, for example with regards to company/community relationships.
- Both Civil Society and industry associations expressed that measuring the cumulative performance of a given industry (in a specific locality or nationally) would inform their work and where to focus.
- Various business representatives noted that tracking practice and behavior change of suppliers, clients and other business partners can be very hard. Audits provide a helpful snapshot of third party policies, processes and human rights risks, but far less about performance over time.
- All participants expressed that in South Africa, a critical issue for more or less all companies is the levels of trust between communities and companies.

Session Three: Thinking About Measurement and Evaluation

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 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.

a. The proposition to go beyond “plan, do, check” to a theory of change model is compelling.

Participants from within companies, and those that advise companies as consultants, noted that current evaluation in business and human rights is limited to planning due diligence, putting systems in place, and checking if they are implemented. This is important when companies are beginning their work on human rights, but it tells us little about effectiveness in terms of change.

b. Using Health and Safety as an entry point to think about indicators will likely be very compelling for mining companies. Because the extractive industry uses leading and lagging indicators in the context of health and safety, this could work very well to open up dialogue about working with both



leading and lagging indicators in mining. Some participants said this might be harder, or certainly new, in other industries like hospitality, finance or food and beverage.

c. The incentives that flow from culture and business models are important to explore. Many participants articulated that performance incentives to meet earning targets can regularly get in the way of embedding respect for human rights. For example, production incentives can undermine health and safety practices. Should we have “human rights penalties” just as mining companies have “safety penalties”? In the hospitality and service industry, customer satisfaction is what drives performance incentives (For everyone - senior managers, receptionists, cleaners, receptionists etc.). What if customer interests and demands contradict what is best for workers? A few business practitioners noted that their companies have in place performance incentives linked to engaging with customers in ways that are consistent with the company’s culture and values.

d. Thinking about the causal pathway demonstrates the need to rework indicators so we understand change, not just levels of activity. Participants reflected that the model presented in the discussion paper is a simple, helpful starting point to open up dialogue about different types of measures. For example, there is very little conversation about measuring behavior change, or indeed linking insights from assessments to outcomes for affected people.

e. Behavior change is not just about the employer but also about workers. Responsible supply chain efforts by brands most often focus on policies, processes and system that change the behavior of employers. This makes sense because the employer holds primary responsibility for upholding labor protections. But workers also need to treat each other with respect, and feel empowered to defend their own rights. This can be a really challenging behavior change to instill.

f. The causal pathway model risks ignoring context and cumulative outcomes. A few participants voiced concern that the causal pathway model seems to be primarily about how an individual business manages a process to achieve improved human right outcomes. Can methodologies that flow from this model both: i) Take into account enough of the contextual issues that affect – even strongly determine – outcomes; and ii) Address how multiple companies might impact the lives of the same workers and communities?

Session Four: Focus on Quality of Relationships with Affected Stakeholders

This session focused on the specific issue of how to evaluate the quality of relationships between companies and affected stakeholders, a key area of exploration for the Valuing Respect project. The discussion centered around the pilot of [ICMM’s Understanding Company-Community Relations Tool-Kit](#) by mining company Gold Fields, with the support of Synergy Global, a responsible business consultancy.



Prior to the presentation of the assessment methodology and learning, Gold Fields and Synergy invited the Chief Executive of advocacy NGO, the Federation for a Sustainable Environment, to share her historical perspective on the relationships between Goldfields and the local communities impacts by their work. She noted a history of escalating conflict and disaffection that formed the basis of advocacy efforts, the establishing of company (including CEO) visits to the community, and programs to empower communities with education about their rights and how to exercise them.

Synergy then led the presentation of the project. By way of overview, the ICMM methodology seeks to evaluate – via questionnaires, focus groups and interviews – the quality of relationships between the company and local community. As noted in the Tool-Kit:

*Community support can be understood as a positive reflection of four factors, or indicators, that reflect the quality of the relationships between a company and its host community. These four indicators overlap to a certain degree and influence one another, and as such, they must be evaluated together. **These are: a) legitimacy; b) compatibility of interests; c) respect; and d) trust.***

*Furthermore, these four indicators must be understood in the contexts within which they exist. These are the contextual factors that influence community support and, ultimately, community–company relationships. They are: **a) sociopolitical and governance context; b) reputational context; and c) equity and social capital considerations.***

The presentations and discussion **surfaced insights that Gold Fields, Synergy and FSE arrived at.** The key headlines were:

a. This type of evaluative exercise can only take place if the context allows, and the right context can take time to develop. The process takes time (3 years in this case) and a considerable amount of coordination and buy-in from a number of key actors. Cooperation with other stakeholders, including local government, was important for stabilizing the environment. The environment has to be right to enable the conversations, and all stakeholder have to trust the organization leading the project (in this case, Synergy).

b. Advocacy work by NGOs can be an important ingredient. All parties felt that the work conducted by the NGO, FSE, functioned to shine a light on the issue many years earlier which led to both: a) efforts by the company to improve engagement with the community; and b) the community becoming more empowered to engage with the company about grievances and their rights.

c. Insights from the gathered data informed organizational changes. The rich amount of data provided by the exercise very much informed company policies, processes and practices including, inter-departmental communication and changes to the internal rewards system.



d. A key learning is that multiple teams/functions impact the company. The work also supported the company to adjust the roles/responsibilities of core business functions that interact with communities (beyond Community Liaison Officers or CSR teams). This extended to ensuring the right people receive human rights and related training.

e. The implementation of such an evaluation is also part of the relationship. Follow-up interviews and focus groups are important because they also support relationship building. Related, it is also important that follow up from such assessments is real i.e. something new must happen or else the quality of the relationship and the willingness to engage diminishes.

f. With the right innovation, it should be possible to conduct similar assessments at a smaller scale and in other industry contexts. The basic principles and indicators set out in the Tool Kit seem relevant for companies beyond the extractive industry. So, application of the evaluation methodology could well be possible. Another key opportunity is to explore how to embed such assessment in ongoing company processes so it is resource-efficient and sustained over time.

Drawing on their own experiences, **participants shared a number of further insights including:**

g. Assessing the quality of relationships should be done with sensitivity to differences and dynamics within the community itself. In South Africa – but also elsewhere – it would seem important to gain insight into how different groups (based on age, race, gender, migrant workers...) feel about their particular relationship with communities. By the same token, the modes of engagement to gather information should be sensitive to the particular dynamics of a given group.

h. Reporting and evaluating company performance often happens at the group or HQ level, but many of the relationship challenges occur at the level of sites, plants and factories. Very often, it is the operational staff at a local level that are unable to engage in respectful and meaningful ways with local communities. Any effort to evaluate and drive change should definitely focus on the behaviors of these individuals.

i. Good quality relationships allow for serendipitous encounters and ownership of interactions by communities. Various participants emphasized that company/ community relationships cannot be formed through company-led and -controlled interactions alone. It is critical for business leaders to participate in community-led meetings, and social and cultural events. Such spaces can create opportunities for serendipitous, unplanned, informal conversations where people often say what really matters to them.

j. Amplifying the voice of affected communities is important, and some initiatives are underway to build the capacity of the communities in this regard. The Bench Marks Foundation shared the following two examples from their own work focused on this issue.



- **The Independent Problem Solving Service (IPSS) and Independent Capacity Building Fund (ICBF).** The IPSS is a new service being developed by the Bench Marks Foundation, designed to effectively resolve problems and issues of communities affected by mining operations where all else has largely failed. It involves broad civil society, community and corporate engagement. Bench Marks is currently testing the service. The ICBF will be responsible for ensuring all participants are adequately capacitated to ensure meaningful and productive dialogue on an equal footing. Areas of envisaged support include: Information access; Community knowledge and skills building; Access to expertise, such as geologists, scientists, environmental experts, social impact specialists, developmental experts, Environmental Impact Assessment expertise and advice, legal practitioners and mediators.
- **Bench Marks Corporate Personality Index:** In 2014, Bench Marks initiated a project to develop a tool for communities and employees to rate (from the bottom up) the performance of corporations who are their neighbors or employers, or often both. Communities and workers rate the company in 60 questions across different categories. The idea is to ascertain if the company is perceived as generous vs greedy, open vs secretive, creative vs disruptive, respectful vs bullying etc. Corporations can also rate themselves, with the idea that from this a measurement of the gap between different parties' perceptions of the corporation is attained. This can ideally be a baseline for future mediation and dialogue.

Session Four: 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:

“It would be interesting to explore how we here in South Africa can continue the conversation about company/ community relationships. Can we all work together to develop methodologies to assess this?”

“It would be useful to, in due course, clarify how the project will support companies in different sectors such as finance. How can it help our ESG risk analysis with clients?”

“It is a complex area. The project should pick where it will focus and do a few things very well, and with simple results that can be applied.”

“In future consultations, we should explore having a wider set of stakeholders in the room, especially worker organizations and the government.”



Next Steps

1. A **summary report** from this consultation will be produced.
2. Completion of South Africa **disclosure research**.
3. Summary **note of key take-aways** from all four consultations in 2018.
4. **Ongoing engagement** with practitioners and experts in diverse disciplines, such as experts in behavioral sciences to learn how to build meaningful measures to change organizational behavior.
5. Sharing interim research outputs on the **online project portal**.



Annex A: Agenda

9am Arrivals and light breakfast

930am Welcome, Objectives and Introductions

945am Session One: The Opportunity

This 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 pitfalls should we avoid?

1030am Break

1045am Session Two: The Current State of Practice (in South Africa and globally)

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 share some early research findings from the project and surface participants' viewpoints about the current state of practice. 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?

Before lunch, as preparation for Session Three, the project team presented 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 few discussion papers for the project, which have been circulated as pre-reads for the meeting.

1230pm Lunch



130pm **Session Three: Thinking about Measurement and Evaluation**

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?
- Do participants have experience with applying these concepts – such as leading and lagging indicators – in their work?
- What other approaches might we consider?

215pm **Break**

230pm **Session Four: Focus on Quality of Relationships with Affected Stakeholders**

The final session of the day will be a deep dive into how we might better evaluate the quality of relationships between companies and affected stakeholders. We explore the following questions:

- What are the ingredients of good-quality company/community relationships?
- What are the red flags that signify the absence or break down of a relationship?
- Is it feasible to measure quality of relationships? If so, how?

430pm **Reflections, Recommendations and Next Steps**

5pm **Close**



Annex B: Participants

- Alan Fine, Associate Director, Russel & Associates
- Allison Burger, Vice President Group Head of Community Relations, Gold Fields
- Arnold Kanyangarara, Workplace Accountability Manager, Coca-Cola
- Guillain Koko, Projects Coordinator, ACCA
- Ian Slade, Consultant, Synergy
- Jayne Mammatt, Partner/Director, Sustainability and Climate Change, PWC
- John Capel, Executive Director, Bench Marks Foundation
- Kerri McDonald, Group Policy, Advocacy and Sustainability, Group Risk, Standard Bank
- Mariette Liefferink, CEO, Federation for a Sustainable Environment
- Nigel Beck, Executive and Group Head Environmental & Social Risk and Finance, Standard Bank
- Nthabiseng Mamotheo Tlhoale, Social Performance, Anglo American
- Paul Kapelus, Director, Synergy
- Tanja Rasmussen, Senior Consultant, Synergy
- Zakithi Zama, Stakeholder Relations Manager, Minerals Council SA
- Josua Loots, Business and Human Rights Unit, Centre for Human Rights, University of Pretoria
- Jana Mudronova, Project Associate, Shift
- 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. 2019

www.valuingrespect.org