



VALUING RESPECT

— BY *Shift* —

First Round of Multi-Stakeholder Expert Consultations

New York, May 17, 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

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. 2018

1. Objectives of the Consultation

On May 17, 2018, Shift's Valuing Respect project team hosted a one day multi-stakeholder expert consultation in New York. This meeting provided the first opportunity for expert stakeholders 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
- explore the potential to integrate rights-holder perspectives into evaluation, including via the use of technology

2. About of 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 www.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, non-governmental 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 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 project should not have, as its goal, to develop a set of indicators and metrics. Rather, the focus should be on methodologies and examples. Participants express that the value-add of this project is to focus on methodologies for evaluation (ideally that can be applied at scale), as well as good practices in developing and using indicators and metrics. Some noted that this central message is critically important to communicate to a wide audience because there is some fatigue – especially among companies – with new indicators, metrics and benchmarks developed by third parties. Others noted that case studies or illustrative examples of meaningful indicators around specific situations would be helpful to show what we are trying to get to noting “we need help reshaping the thinking”. Early on, even synthesizing and analyzing what exists about current practice, approaches and lessons from diverse fields will be a major contribution. The first ask is that we all learn and then we can move forward.

b. The project should keep the focus on outcomes for people: Participants strongly supported that the project should ultimately be concerned with what leads to better outcomes for people. Everyone recognized that it can be hard to get meaningful measures of this, but still felt that making progress in this direction will be the project’s biggest value-add.

c. Clarity will be required about audiences, end-users and use cases. Participants recognized the importance of building insights and tools that everyone can use – including companies in different industries and individuals and organizations from across stakeholder groups. At the same time, many said that the project should not try and be all things to all people. Even if some products are useful for everyone, it will be important to develop outputs with specific end-users and use-cases in mind. Otherwise, there is a risk that the project will remain abstract.

d. The project should learn from diverse disciplines. Participants agreed that the project should look beyond the obvious places for insights and approaches. Many reinforced the importance of looking to the development field, health and safety and behavioral science. At the same time, we need to recognize that even fields such as international development, that have spent longer exploring these issues, do not have all the answers yet. So we also need to be bold in seeking genuinely fresh approaches.

e. Quantification and metrics are important but challenging. The discussion surfaced a number of perspectives about the role of quantification and metrics, or scores, that aggregate different aspects of performance. The views can be summarized as follows:

- Business leaders respond well to numbers and simple data points. Unless we can quantify and measure some of these issues, they will not get the attention of people in the business that matter. We are competing for very limited time and attention so we need to be concise.
- A value-add of using simplified, composite indicators is that it allows for evaluation at breadth and scale, as well as enabling comparison.
- At the same time, many external stakeholders – including investors – derive limited value from a single metric or handful of metrics that purport to represent a company’s entire social or human rights performance. It can be more useful to have indicators of things to look for and ask about. This reflects that we are dealing with complex systems and need tools to gain insight into whether critical aspects of those systems are appropriate and robust.

- Some – in particular from civil society – raised the concern that quantification can lead to valuing rights in monetary terms. The moment that we start putting a dollar price on clean water, good health, or privacy is when it becomes easy to start negotiating certain rights away, which would be a perverse outcome.
- It was highlighted that quantification should not be confused or conflated with monetization – placing a ‘dollar amount’ on positive or negative outcomes. While monetized value is relevant to any business case, it is only one form of quantitative data. Moreover, current accounting practices fail to capture the financial consequences to both companies and society of many human rights impacts.

f. Getting the right relationship with ESG, and human rights ranking, ratings and indices: Participants supported the proposition that the project should not seek to displace existing ratings, rankings and indices. Rather, the project should set out to offer insights that can be used by leaders of these efforts to improve their work. One challenge is that much of the detail of these efforts has to be driven by what companies disclose, while company disclosure is also driven by these external frameworks. The project might create a good space to break the cycle and add value to everyone.

g. Listening to people who are impacted. Participants from across stakeholder groups made the point that it is impossible to get a strong sense of how business is doing without asking for the views of the people whose lives the work is trying to address. Too often, we get lost in indicators, metrics and data that convey nothing of human experience. This resonated with the theory of change at the core of the labor rights movement: if meaningful change will occur only when workers are able to freely associate and bargain, it is obvious that this must be something we monitor, track and indeed use to guide policy and action.

h. Different views on the value of evidence of the business case. The project team proposed that an aspect of the research should focus on tracking data regarding outcomes for business related to a company’s human rights performance. There were differing perspectives on whether this was necessary. The views can be summarized as follows:

- There is a danger that companies will only focus on actions that deliver measurable (positive or negative) outcomes for business, and ignore actions that might be most important to address impacts on people.
- Providing more data to back up the business case is unnecessary: if a company does not see the business case / rationale for respecting human rights, then new data on it unlikely to change mindsets.
- It is important to understand what motivates companies to start and sustain this journey to implement respect for human rights across their business, and then to reinforce this with credible data points.
- It can be helpful to speak to companies using language and accounting concepts that make sense and encourage attention: for example, talking about risk-adjusted returns in the context of human rights related company/community conflict.

i. Being aware of how data are received, interpreted and used to drive behavior: Some participants emphasized that the project should take care to understand how information is interpreted and then acted on in a company context. Sometimes, good data simply sits in one silo of a company or organization without really affecting business decisions and management practices. Others noted that the project should pay attention to the incentives or legal structures that might cause businesses to ignore, or be blind to, good metrics.

Session Two: The Problem

In this session, participants worked in small break out groups organized along stakeholder lines (i.e. business, investors, academia, and NGOs and worker organizations) to **identify diverse views on 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 - and as key themes formed - the project team shared **some headlines from their early research**.

a. Understanding indicators in context: There was a general critique of 'counting without context'. For example, simply asking for numbers of assessments or the number of problems found does not convey whether the company is focusing on the salient issues or the relative scale of a problem and trends over time. Saying that a company's board has human rights or sustainability as a standing agenda item means nothing if it is one slide in 100 that they skip over. Reflections on this topic included:

- Wherever possible, metrics and indicators should be interpreted in context. Information taken out of context loses its full power and meaning. Where this is unavoidable, then this fact should be recognized and honestly conveyed.
- Communications are pressed to become ever more concise, speaking often PowerPoint bullets, soundbites and data points. It becomes a challenge to qualify data in such contexts.
- In a corporate reporting context, it should be both possible and a priority to ask companies to provide the necessary contextual narrative.

b. Communicating to the right people in the company: Some noted that, at present, a lot of the information about risks and progress stays in the sustainability function / department. It will be important to figure out what information will get the attention and then inform decisions/actions of CEOs, CFOs, General Counsels etc.

c. Some indicators are just bad...but the feedback loops to change this are weak or non-existent. A few participants made the point that some indicators in existing rankings, ratings and indices are wrong and unhelpful. This is also driven by what companies disclose, which can also be bad. Companies often - by choice or based on an external requirement - address issues and questions that have little to do with the day-to-day reality of the company. Some participants noted that feedback loops between the providers and demanders of data are not strong. Companies often do not respond well when they are told that their indicators are meaningless. It is also hard for companies to offer similar feedback to investors, and rankings, ratings and indices.

d. The gap in communicating about stakeholder identification and engagement. Many civil society participants saw a key indicator of business performance as being whether the business offers a robust picture of its stakeholder eco-system and engagements. This is often lacking or weak in company reporting. CSOs would like to know from companies who they see as stakeholders; how they identify and engage with them; how they empower them to speak with the company; and what feedback loops they provide about any changes that result.

e. The impact of shrinking civic space: Some participants raised concerns about the challenge of accessing meaningful data about rights-holder experiences and situations on the ground due to political contexts that make it hard to unearth data and dangerous for people to speak freely.

Early research areas and findings: highlights

During the session, the project team presented some of the early avenues of research and initial findings. These 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;
 - The vast majority of questions relate to inputs and activities with a focus on audit data, training, and words in a policy;
 - Questions asked by the ESG ratings are overwhelmingly 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 in their evaluation of the sustainability/social performance of the same companies.

- Based on research into the **public reporting of 130 companies across 7 different sectors**:
 - The dominant reported data-points relate to: H&S (fatalities, injuries); Diversity and inclusion; Audits/assessments; Training hours/numbers; and Complaints received/processed.
 - There are more nuanced and outcome-oriented data in areas of long-standing expertise e.g. OHS in extractives, privacy in ICT and child labor in agriculture.
 - There are good examples of case studies at farm/factory/site level with data that demonstrates the pathway from activities to outcomes for people.

- Based on an initial set of **interviews with company practitioners**, the project team has identified interesting areas for future exploration such as:
 - Business leaders (formally or informally) tracking behavior changes following training or capacity-building work.
 - Innovations/pilots to assess outcomes on certain salient issues e.g. on livelihoods, living wage, women’s empowerment.
 - Attention given to *how* a certain measure is used (e.g. punitive v. problem-solving) and how this alters information flows.
 - 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 need to be kept in mind when evaluating business respect for human rights, such as:
 - What is *easy to* measure gets managed (and invested in), often in preference to what it’s *meaningful* to measure and therefore manage;
 - When a measure becomes a target, it ceases to be a good measure: it often incentivizes behaviors that distort the very thing it seeks to measure.
 - “Uncertainty absorption” – single, seemingly clear metrics can mask nuanced, judgment-based information that would tell a different story.
 - Indicator design is rarely (if ever) neutral.

Each of these areas of research, with related findings and conclusions, will be elaborated further in forthcoming written outputs from the project, and will be made available through the Valuing Respect web portal.

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.

In general, there was strong participant support – from across stakeholder groups - for introducing the **causal pathway model** (sometimes termed 'logical framework', 'results framework' or 'impact pathway') into how we approach evaluating business respect for human rights. More specific observations were as follows:

a. Broader relevance of the causal pathway model: Participants noted that the use of causal pathway models is becoming more common in the responsible business field. For example, the WBCSD use a similar 'impact pathway' in their Social and Human Capital Protocol; B-Lab use this model when assessing companies to see where they can sensibly draw linkages between what is measured and certain outcomes; NYU Stern have used it to analyze the social indicators in ESG. This speaks to the validity of using the approach in the Valuing Respect project. At the same time, it is important to clarify how using this in this context may differ from existing applications. For instance, it is distinct from an impact pathway that focuses on how local employment, investment and procurement may positively impact people's lives?

b. The important focus on outcomes for people: Echoing inputs earlier in the day, participants emphasized that starting with the desired outcomes for people, and constructing a causal pathway, or theory of change, towards those outcomes is the right approach.

c. The need to clarify that this is not about the UNGPs idea of cause, contribution and direct linkage: Some participants raised the possibility of confusion with the language of the UN Guiding Principles, which differentiate whether companies cause, contribute to, or are linked to human rights impacts. The project team affirmed that this is much more a tool to evaluate the effectiveness of interventions, looking at the pathway from business actions to (hopefully improved) outcomes for people. The team also confirmed that distinctions between 'attribution' and 'contribution' when it comes to the effects of company interventions on outcomes would be further explored.

d. The distinction between “outcome” and “impact”: A few participants noted that the project team has used and stopped with outcomes for people when many (of most) frameworks go beyond that to address impact. The project team noted that when used in the international development arena,

impact tends to sit at the level of a contextual, bigger societal change level, but outcome is more specific to an individual experience. A number of participants said this would need more thinking especially where contextual

factors, such as inequality, the law or gender discrimination, do make a difference to the effectiveness of company interventions.

e. Feedback loops and assumptions: Some participants noted that the causal pathway model can oversimplify complex dynamics. For example, it does not address situations where a certain activity or output might in fact demand a new and different type of input, creating a feedback loop between steps along the pathway before one can move further forward. Equally, the paper did not fully explore the “if / then” assumptions within the theory of change, which can be fundamental to whether it actually plays out as intended. The project team undertook to flesh this out more fully.

f. Measuring “intangibles”: Some participants suggested that the project team look into methodologies to measure intangibles such as the experience of rights-holders; changes in mindsets/attitudes within companies; and corporate culture.

Regarding the forum **organizational features** proposed in the discussion paper, participants expressed that these are all highly relevant for how well a business will be able to operate with respect for human rights.

a. On governance and culture, specific observations were that:

- Culture and governance is always going to be unique to each company. There is no one organizational chart that is ‘best’. But that does not preclude that certain features of culture and governance are particularly crucial to respect-respecting practices, and could be evaluated with some success.
- Governance is not just about formal roles, responsibilities and lines of accountability. It is also about power and influence in the organization. Staff that lead on sustainability of social compliance often lack the necessary influence and decision-making power when it comes to business strategy, sourcing and other decisions that so often affect outcomes.
- This feature should explicitly take the role and actions of leaders into account and might be relabeled as “Leadership, governance and culture”.
- Annual reporting, ratings, benchmarks and audits can be likened to taking a snap shot of a machine, while assessments of governance and culture look into the engine behind the machine.
- In general, companies that are well governed are sober with themselves about risks (financial, legal, operational, reputational..) and in their approach to addressing them.
- National influences on business cultures and attitudes to specific rights can also be significant, as in the case of the commonly anti-union culture in the United States.
- There are also different cultures within a company. For example, the culture of the legal division can be very different from accounting, marketing, and so forth. So culture is typically not consistent across the business. Moreover, while respect for human rights requires that companies go beyond the baseline that the law requires, if the culture is one of compliance only, this is hard to achieve.

b. On business model and strategy, specific observations were that:

- It is critical to evaluate a company in relation to how well it is managing risks that are inherent to the business model and strategy.
- The clear and often-used example is purchasing practices in the apparel industry. More recent examples included Facebook’s failure to manage the inherent privacy risks in a business model based on accumulating personal data so as to sell marketing insights that can target certain users.
- This discussion linked back to questions of governance (structures, power and influence) since the individuals stewarding a human rights policy may not have influence to affect the businesses’ core business decisions.

- Companies also play an important role in supporting or undermining norms, public policy and laws. This is increasingly central to business model and strategy. But the enterprise risk management, or governance affairs teams leading this are rarely subject to any checks and balances in place to uphold responsible business policies.

c. On the quality of company/rights-holder relationships, specific observations were that:

- This element is a critical lynchpin in evaluation of business respect for human rights. The other features are almost meaningless if this is not addressed.
- There are clear benefits for everyone when companies get this right such as empowering stakeholders, achieving better balances of power between companies and impacted people, increasing trust and providing better insight into company due diligence efforts.
- Affected stakeholders are rarely a homogenous group. For example, in an extractives context a 'community' will include diverse perspectives. One relevant indicator may be how companies define stakeholders and understand the nuances of viewpoint, experience, and vulnerability among them.
- Closing civic space in many areas of the world can make it very hard for companies to form meaningful relationships with companies and access perspectives of affected rights-holders.
- Sometimes a company may believe it is engaging productively with an organization that represents affected stakeholders when that group has in fact been coopted. This adds to the challenge of evaluation in this area.

Participants raised a number of additional **ideas related to concepts** in the discussion paper:

a. The organizational features are interconnected: Participants generally felt that that leaders inside companies – and those evaluating company performance from outside – need to pay attention to all four of the key features discussed in the paper because they reinforce each other. Culture affects stakeholder relationships; business models effect culture and so on.

b. Measurement in relation to the four features might be hard: Participants noted that measuring areas that are “soft” such as culture and the quality of relationships is challenging. At the same time, some – notably from companies – said that even asking questions in relation to these types of indicators would educate business leaders about what it is important to look for.

c. The connection between the causal pathway model and the key features: Participants encouraged the project team to be clearer about the relationship between the causal pathway model and the key features. Some felt that the key features risked taking the project towards a general discussion of certain areas that were felt to be important, while losing the clarity of connections between company actions and decisions on the one hand and practices, behaviors and outcomes for people on the other.

Session Four: Innovations, Cross-pollination and Collaboration

This session started with two presentations from participants and break-out discussions 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**. Discussions also 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 effectiveness of responses. Key examples of 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 was also a key feature.

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. And communities may need support to ensure that their inputs are also seen as credible from the perspective of a company or government.

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. Ensuring technology does not erode rights realization or effective human engagement: 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.

b. Leveraging existing workplace monitoring and “tangential” data: Some participants mentioned the increased use of technological tools to gather and monitor data in the workplace. This could be used positively or negatively. Examples included the use of wearables to assess and support workplace health and safety; or monitoring when sewing machines are used, or warehouse temperatures, to gain insight into working hours. But this data could also be used negatively (eg to fire people with identified health conditions). The risks need to be assessed as well as the opportunities.

c. Data gathering needs to be acted on in order to sustain engagement The point was made that where new methods to gather worker perspectives have been deployed, they sometimes lead to an initial spike in engagement. However, if the company does not then act on the data and explain what they have done, workers often disengage. Incentives for people to keep taking time to share their perspectives are important.

d. Use of technology for civil society and communities: Participants felt it would be useful for the project to address how technology can be used by civil society and communities to evaluate progress, not simply how business can use these tools.

e. Some challenges with worker perspectives: While agreeing with the premise that information on worker perspectives and experiences should be part of any evaluation of progress, a few participants raised some challenges that can be encountered by business. First, it is not always easy to get access to worker perspectives in

the supply chain. Sometimes suppliers are not willing to enable such access. Other times, a company may not have a contractual relationship with the supplier or suppliers where they are trying to achieve change. Second, sometimes workers may want outcomes (such as additional overtime) that are not rights-compatible.

f. Need for good examples: Participants suggested that it would be useful to have a database of positive success stories in securing rights-holder input (with and without technology). Where has it been done effectively and in line with human rights principles?

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:

“This project is asking the right and hard questions. This is a key value. But make sure the outputs and ideas are as practical as possible.”

“The research agenda seems extremely ambitious, so encourage a point of focus. In terms of consultations, it would be good to have some in manufacturing countries, when the time is right.”

“We’re talking about very different industries with various levels of complexity. We should try and find a way to evaluate outcomes with these differences in mind. This will need nimble and flexible tools.”

“On the academic side, what research has been done by others that we can learn from? There is real value in collating all of this, working out what we already know, and sharing the highlights”

“This is just as hard as we thought it was. Try and figure out what this project is going to be ‘when it grows up’ to give some clear parameters to the work”

“There are so many directions in which this project can go in, and you can’t do everything. After the next two convenings, perhaps sit back and crystallize. It is brave to keep it so open-ended at this stage, so keep the scope open for next few consultations, but then really narrow it, because this can’t be all things to all people.”

“One size just won’t fit all, so what are elements that stakeholders should be looking for and questions we should be asking. If there are open-ended research questions, say that, but at least help us get past specific quantified indicators that are monetized.”

Next Steps

1. A **summary report** from this consultation
2. Three more **expert consultations** in 2018: London (Jul); Singapore (Aug); Johannesburg (Nov)
3. Going deeper into the research agenda to develop **initial public outputs**
4. **Ongoing engagement** with practitioners and experts in diverse disciplines
5. Launch of public **online project portal**
6. Inviting **ideas, critiques, and suggestions**

0830 Arrivals and light breakfast

0900 Welcome, Objectives and Introductions

0930 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?

1100 Break

1115 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?

1245 Lunch

1330 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?

1500 Break

1530 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

1700 Session Five: Reflections, Recommendations and Next Steps

1730 End

ANNEX B – PARTICIPANTS

- Kindra Mohr, Policy Director, Accountability Counsel
- Laetitia Yafai, Program Associate - Measure What Matters, B-Lab
- Monica Chen, Client Relations, Bloomberg
- Ariel Meyerstein, Senior Vice-President, Corporate Sustainability, Citi Group/
- Joanne Bauer, Senior Researcher, Business and Human Rights, Institute for the Study of Human Rights, Columbia University
- Adam Kanzer, Managing Director of Corporate Engagement, Domini
- Brendan LeBlanc, Partner - Climate Change and Sustainability Services, EY
- Heeral Coleman, Director, Stakeholder Services and Communications, Fair Labor Association
- Emily Smith Ewing, Senior Fellow - Executive Director, Corporate Social Responsibility Program, Fordham University
- Amol Mehra, Managing Director, North America, Freedom Fund
- Killian Moote, Project Director, Know The Chain, Humanity United
- Dan Bross, Independent Advisor
- Ashleigh Owens, Independent Advisor
- David Spitzley, Responsible Workplace Senior Manager, Mars
- Terry Nelidov, Managing Director, Erb Institute, University of Michigan
- Casey O'Connor, Sani Fellow, Centre for Business and Human Rights, NYU Stern
- Chloe Christman Cole, Senior Advisor, Land Rights and Market, Oxfam America
- Jaren Dunning, Legal Director, Human Rights, Pepsico
- Lou Munden, Founder, TMP Systems
- Rachel Chambers, Human Rights, UNGC Office
- Erika George, Professor of Law - Co-Director Center for Global Justice, University of Utah
- Beata Faracik, President of the Board, Polish Institute for Human Rights and Business

Project Team (Shift)

- Caroline Rees, President
- John Sherman, General Counsel and Senior Advisor
- Sara Blackwell, Advisor
- Michelle Langlois, Reporting Program Advisor
- Nora Mardirossian, Reporting Program Advisor
- Mark Hodge, Senior Associate