



VALUING RESPECT

— BY *Shift* —

VALUING RESPECT

Second Round of Expert Multi-Stakeholder Consultations

London, July 2, 2019



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.

Valuing Respect is generously funded by:



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

© Shift Project, Ltd. 2019



1. Executive Summary

On July 2nd, Shift held an expert, multi-stakeholder consultation in London with participants from business, civil society, investing, government, academia and other expert organizations, to share and seek feedback on its work under the Valuing Respect project. This three-year collaborative initiative aims to identify better ways to evaluate business respect for human rights. Further background on the project is available through its [online portal](#).

In 2018, the first year of the Valuing Respect project, research focused on:

- a. the empirical evidence of the current weaknesses in how companies' human rights performance is assessed, both from within companies and by external stakeholders.
- b. identifying a range of workstreams through which the project could deconstruct the challenge of evaluation and, in partnership with other organizations, look for ways to reconstruct better approaches for testing and consultation.

The resulting workstreams are set out at Annex A, with a summary of the envisaged products from each.

This consultation was the second multi-stakeholder discussion in 2019, and an opportunity to share progress from four of the project's workstreams that are furthest advanced: a 'theory of change' evaluation method; "red flag" indicators of human rights risk in business models; and indicators of rights-respecting leadership and governance. The consultation was aimed at sharing early-stage draft products and seeking feedback. In a fourth instance on models and methodologies for including affected stakeholders in evaluation, the consultation was an opportunity to share some examples and deepen the discussion about approaches that could be effective in different contexts.

The headlines from participant feedback and discussion were:

On the **Theory of Change Methodology for Evaluation**

- The methodology provides a new way of thinking that is robust and accessible.
- The primary focus on outcomes for people is the right approach, while addressing the relationship of those outcomes to business results is also welcome.
- It will be valuable to provide prompts to help companies think through the critical assumptions that underpin any theory of change.
- Making the methodology easy for business practitioners to adopt is an important next step.

On **Red Flag Indicators of Human Rights Risks in Business Models**

- There is distinct value in calling out these risks at the level of the business model, and participants offered inputs to aid in the overall framing.
- There are various opportunities to tighten up the red flags, including through further consultation with subject matter experts and to capture important practical nuances.



- There are some common business activities that may need to be reflected in the tool.

On **Indicators of Rights-Respecting Leadership and Governance**

- The indicators need to balance being aspirational and setting an achievable baseline.
- There is a need for clarity on the focus of these indicators (i.e, do they focus on whether rights-respecting norms and values are in place, rather than the processes through which to develop them.)
- Indicators concerning how the CEO or other senior leaders act need to address a few nuances not currently reflected in the draft.

On **Engaging Affected Stakeholders in Evaluation**

- There is clear value in engaging affected stakeholders in evaluation, and the quality of relationships between a company and affected individuals is very often a leading indicator of human rights outcomes.
- There can be challenges if monitoring and evaluation efforts are initiated and funded by the company as opposed to civil society groups, affected stakeholders or third parties.
- While interventions of this kind can be resource-intensive, companies and their partners can gain much more robust and nuanced evidence of which programs and processes are driving positive change in people's lives, and why.

In the final session, participants were invited to share **reflections from the consultation and guidance to the project team going forward**. Recommendations included that the team should:

- Set out how the various focal areas and resources interrelate to each other, including how companies and their stakeholders can find the entry points into the work that meet their own needs.
- Share more practical examples of innovations because showing the “art of the possible” can massively reduce the barrier to entry.
- Provide examples and/or explore pilots that address downstream human rights risks, where customers and end-use of products and services are of key concern).
- Continue to drive forward the separate workstream on accounting because once we can seed better evaluation practices, we need to ensure that we capture value erosion and creation for business and society so that markets can adjust to this new information.

The remainder of this summary report elaborates on the key points from the discussions. The meeting agenda and a list of participants are included in Annexes B and C.



2. Testing a Methodology for Better Evaluation

In the opening session, Shift presented initial work to develop a tool for evaluating business processes or interventions aimed at advancing respect for human rights. The methodology has been developed following research and wide-ranging consultations in 2018. It builds on long-standing methodologies from the development and public policy arenas while adapting them to the specific context of business and human rights. It is not intended to evaluate a company's entire approach to respect for human rights, but to look at whether specific interventions or activities are leading to positive outcomes for people.

Shift sent an introduction to the methodology to participants ahead of the consultation. Participants raised various questions and reactions as part of the discussion. Key points included:

The methodology provides a new way of thinking that is robust and accessible.

Participants expressed that the Theory of Change approach promises to add rigor to how companies and their stakeholders decide what to measure, and what they learn from it. They felt that the process, while simple, helpfully embeds new ways of thinking that move a company beyond a focus on the development of programs and activities by directing indicators towards the ultimate outcomes for people at the heart of human rights due diligence. One company, PepsiCo, that had already piloted part of the Theory of Change process reinforced these points, noting that the method helpfully takes a company out of its comfort zone and pushes it to interrogate what results it is achieving and how it will know whether it succeeds.

Some of the evaluation experts and civil society representatives in the meeting noted that the methodology strikes a good balance between preserving the key principles and discipline of Theory of Change based evaluation, and adapting it to the realities of business and human rights contexts.

The primary focus on outcomes for people is the right approach, while addressing the relationship of those outcomes to business results is also welcome.

The attention to outcomes for business *in relationship to outcomes for people* was seen as a valuable addition in the methodology. On the one hand, some individuals recognized that the business benefits that flow from respecting human rights need to be better articulated, captured and evidenced by practitioners in order to reinforce investment into company programs. On the other hand, it was noted that the current paradigm to prioritize only those outcomes for people that deliver easily measurable business results is problematic.

Discussions also highlighted the challenge that companies tend to value evidence that comes in the form of business metrics and financial figures, more than evidence in the form of people's experiences. It was felt that the application of the proposed methodology, supported by feedback from affected stakeholders, could serve to redress this imbalance.



One participant familiar with applying Theory of Change thinking underlined the value of engaging affected stakeholders to test a theory of change, since their knowledge of practical barriers, incentive structures, attitudes and interests could surface a range of risky assumptions.

It will be valuable to provide prompts to help companies think through the critical assumptions that underpin any theory of change.

There was strong support for the proposition that companies and their partners should make explicit, monitor and manage the assumptions that underpin the Theory of Change for any intervention related to human rights. Participants suggested that Shift should introduce prompts and questions in order to support company practitioners and other users with this part of the methodology. Suggestions included:

- Encouraging companies to list some of the very practical challenges they are already aware of, such as securing adequate resource inputs, difficulties with engaging internal colleagues or difficulties in accessing affected stakeholders who are not employees.
- Developing prompts for companies to factor in the power dynamics that could impact either the ability of an affected group to engage with the company, or an individual's ability to drive change in her or his company.
- Ensuring that companies do not ignore the role that market forces and commercial dynamics play in the success or failure of their interventions.

Making the methodology easy for business practitioners to adopt is an important next step.

Participants expressed enthusiasm for Shift's plans to pilot the methodology with a handful of pioneer companies in order to refine the approach and inform the design of the final product. The discussion identified a few early suggestions for Shift to support the user-friendliness and uptake of the product.

Some of these suggestions centered on the language used: for example, referring to the final product as a business management tool, or using language that may be more familiar to companies such as strategy or learning, instead of theory of change. Others suggestions centered on the value of being clear about when a company might be ready to engage with the Theory of Change method in a meaningful way. This could depend on their existing knowledge, capabilities and maturity in their journey to implement respect for human rights.

Finally, participants welcomed the plan to share case studies and learning from the pilots, with some noting that seeing proof of concept and the benefits that companies garner from using the approach may significantly reduce barriers to entry for others.



3. Red Flag Indicators of Human Rights Risks in Business Models

The Shift team presented a first draft of a range of “red flag” indicators of human rights risks inherent in certain business models. A short introduction paper had been shared with participants ahead of the meeting.

The team noted that the indicators were aimed primarily at companies’ senior management and boards, as well as investors. They were designed to be concise and help leaders quickly see how certain features of a business model that may be under discussion, and which might make good sense from a purely economic perspective, also raise critical risks to human rights that they should take equal care to address.

Participants were asked to consider whether the categorization of the indicators as “Commodities”, “Operational Partners”, “Cost-Saving Measures” and “Sales-Maximizing Measures” made sense or could be improved. They discussed in small groups the specific red flag indicators in each category and the types of information included for each red flag, and were asked for feedback on what was missing or could be improved. Key discussion points included:

There is distinct value in calling out these risks at the level of the business model, and participants offered inputs to aid in the overall framing.

Participants noted that where human rights risk is embedded in a business model, routine mitigation measures will struggle to change business practices. Senior leaders could not expect these issues to be fixed at the operational level. It was seen as particularly important to call this out.

Discussions highlighted that it would be helpful to have clearer definitions of what is meant by a “business model”, or at least some criteria or principles that an investor or other stakeholder could follow to discern business model red flags. This reinforced inputs from previous consultations which tackled the question of spotting the fine line between problematic or high-risk business practices on the one hand, and those practices that are baked into business models.

In the spirit of making the resource easier to navigate and use, it was felt that the content presented should be at a more consistent level of specificity. For example, some indicators referred to very specific products and others were more general in nature. A few participants noted that some indicators cut across more than one category (e.g. “cost-saving measures” alongside “sales-maximizing measures”), and that it would be helpful to convey this reality more clearly.

There are various opportunities to tighten up the red flags, including through further consultation with subject matter experts, to capture important practical nuances.

Participants noted that the supporting information in the draft red flags resource not only has value in guiding investor and senior leader attention, but also for those in companies seeking to drive change at an operational level. Many expressed interest in reviewing the next version of the tool once information



about possible mitigation measures and supporting resources has been added.

The discussion also reinforced the importance of Shift engaging with subject matter experts to refine the detail of some of the indicators and supporting information. Some of the inputs pertained to the formulation of an indicator, for example when it comes to commodities with low prices versus volatile prices, and differing risk in differing models for trading commodities.

There was also a note of caution about artificially limiting the list of relevant human rights impacts or potentially affected stakeholders. For example, privacy is not only relevant in relation to data collection; and workers may be at risk, as well as communities, in some partnerships with SOEs. Many noted it would be fairly straightforward to make these types of adjustment without compromising on the welcome simplicity and accessibility of the resource.

There are some common business activities that may need to be reflected in the tool. Discussions surfaced two features of business that are increasingly common across industries and operating contexts. The first was automation (both data-driven decision-making and the use of advanced robotics) in ways that exacerbate various human rights risks. The second was company engagement in public policy lobbying that aims to preserve and support business models with significant human rights risks. Participants encouraged the project team to reflect on how these activities might be reflected in the red flags resource.

One or two suggestions were also made for additional red flag categories, such as ‘corporate structure’. There were more suggestions regarding additional features of business models, which included: growth by acquisition; taking minority stakes in joint ventures; sponsorship; corporate lending; offering the cheapest products; partnering with governments as part of infrastructure or public service delivery. Again, discussions explored which of these were simply (if importantly) problematic practices, and which could, at times, form a feature of a business model and should therefore be included in this particular set of indicators.

4. Indicators of Rights-Respecting Leadership and Governance

In the session on leadership and governance indicators, the Shift team first summarized the research they conducted into corporate culture, particularly in the context of business ethics and health and safety. While typical indicators of governance look at formal systems that dictate what *should* happen within an organization, the team’s interest had been in looking at indicators that give an insight into culture – an organization’s pervasive values and norms – since culture reflects what *actually* happens.

The team had shared with participants in advance of the consultation a paper identifying those values and norms that appear to be particularly significant for ensuring respect for human rights – [*Rights-Respecting Corporate Culture: Identifying the Cultural Norms and Values that Underpin Business Respect for Human*](#)



[Rights \(PDF\)](#). In the meeting, they shared a first draft of Leadership and Governance Indicators for a rights-respecting culture, categorized according to these values and norms.

Participants provided feedback on the identified values and norms themselves and then broke into small groups to review and discuss the individual draft indicators within each category. Key discussion points included:

The indicators need to balance being aspirational and setting an achievable baseline.

Some participants expressed the view that the current indicators speak to a high-level of maturity in company human rights commitments and practices. As such, the indicators risk not being applicable in more than a few companies. At the same time, participants recognized that there is value in setting the bar high with these indicators, because embedding respect for human rights into business culture is very much a leading indicator of better outcomes for people. Further, lowering the bar too much might lead to indicators being vacuous or easily gamed, telling one little about how company leadership and governance are informing culture.

In the pursuant discussion, participants recommended that Shift further explore how to apply different maturity levels to the design of indicators, and/or in the final format and design of the product.

A need for clarity that these indicators focus on whether rights-respecting norms and values are in place, rather than the processes through which to develop them.

There was strong support for focusing on how leadership and governance reflect those elements of a company's culture most relevant to respect for human rights. At the same time, discussions reflected the fact that indicators of leadership and governance have more typically looked at tactics for achieving a certain kind of culture. For example, typical indicators look at whether a company has put in place training and systems to support employees to speak up about human rights concerns, rather than whether and how leaders model and reward the behavior of speaking up. Discussions suggested a need to be really clear about these distinctions.

Discussions also highlighted the risk that the indicators become too prescriptive as to how the values and norms of rights-respecting cultures are realized in practice. For example, a breakout group noted that one indicator seems to suggest that formal cross-functional teams are a necessary condition of realizing individual empowerment and responsibility.

With these reflections in mind, participants supported the plan to elaborate on illustrative examples of how companies have already implemented practices that align with the spirit of the indicators.

Indicators concerning CEO or other senior leaders' behavior need to address a few nuances not currently reflected in the draft.

The discussion reinforced that the indicators need to address the role of CEOs and senior leaders, but this also comes with challenges. First and foremost, there are very different conceptions of what the actions of a CEO demonstrate about corporate commitment and seriousness regarding respect for



human rights. For example, being present on a public platform with a human rights defenders might be seen as blue-wash by some stakeholders but a profound act of solidarity by others.

Beyond this, participants raised some specific issues regarding the behavior of CEO and senior leaders for further consideration, including that:

- Where a CEO lobbies a relevant institution to advance human rights protections, it most often may be done privately, not publicly.
- Omissions are important. In other words, when a CEO or senior leader does not use a critical moment to reinforce respect for human rights, it can undermine even the most consistent positive private and public tone from the top. An example would be when internal messages about improving sales targets or cost savings are not accompanied by reminders of the company's commitment to responsible conduct.
- While it may be important for the most senior leader with formal accountability to have working relationships and influence with many relevant colleagues across the business, it can more often be the individual or team of individuals who are leading the work day-to-day that need this access.

5. Engaging Affected Stakeholders in Evaluation

In the final session, the Shift team outlined research they had been conducting on participatory evaluation, and its application to a business and human rights context. A [research paper](#) had been shared with participants in advance of the consultation. The team summarized the five distinct phases in evaluation, in each of which affected stakeholders could play a valuable role, (even if in practice they are often seen just as a source of data). The team outlined their ongoing work to identify methodologies and models being applied by companies, often in collaboration with for-profit or non-profit partners, to involve affected stakeholders in a broader array of roles for evaluating the effectiveness of the company's efforts to tackle human rights risks.

In the remainder of the session, participants presented two such cases:

Learnings from customer satisfaction surveys for a business and human rights context

- In the first case, an organization created a distinct approach to collect, analyze and report data using methods popularized in the customer satisfaction field. They asked "How likely are you to recommend X (a product/service/company...) to your friend?", and this became a gold standard question known as the "net promoter score".
- The learnings had been adapted to identify predictive questions to evaluate the quality of company-stakeholder relationships as the main driver of outcomes for people. Well-designed questions administered in quick surveys over time had been used to draw correlations, and collected data had been disaggregated in ways that had revealed complex relationships between trust and the quality of outcomes for stakeholders.



- The organization had designed a cycle of collecting and analyzing data, finding solutions and providing feedback to stakeholders. Their experience underlined the fact that stakeholders need to feel that any company seeking their insights has taken their inputs into consideration. This act of “closing the loop” had been crucial for increasing stakeholders’ willingness to participate in repeat evaluation surveys.
- The approach had been used in evaluating the quality of relationships between a forestry company and adjacent communities in Southern Africa, coffee growers and a buyer in Latin America, and in a variety of public policy and international development programs.

“Most Significant Change” Methodology in a Context where Child Labor is Prevalent

- In the second case, an organization was working with a company buying an agricultural product from farmers in which child labor had been historically prevalent. The organization and the company had established an extensive field monitoring system, which combined ongoing tracking of product quality with labor practice monitoring.
- Building on the field monitoring system as a way to identify human rights risk, the organization piloted an additional method, the Most Significant Change, to improve the quality of collected data. By training local social science graduates in the data collection method, the organization was able to engage with farmers through detailed interviews to explore changes to their lives as a result of the company’s program. Collected narratives were subsequently interpreted and analyzed in focus groups with the interview participants. Each group then collectively decided what changes reported in the stories were the most significant and which were not.
- The methodology allowed the company not only to identify evidence of the impacts of their programs on farmers, but also to capture changes to people’s lives without the danger of cherry-picking those stories that are most positive from the company’s perspective.
- Despite the positive results, the pilot had several limitations, including its geographical scope and small sample size, which the company aims to address in future phases.

Discussions

In discussions, **participants expressed support for engaging affected stakeholders in evaluation, as well as the idea that the quality of relationships between a company and affected individuals is very often a leading indicator of human rights outcomes.** One participant noted that it will be a positive development to see participatory evaluation used in relation to evaluating human rights outcomes beyond health and safety, or job satisfaction, to explore issues that are often hidden or hard to grasp, such as discrimination, intimidation, collective bargaining, or freedom of expression. It was underlined that the use of participatory evaluation will need to navigate the realities of shrinking civil space.

Participants explored the issues that may arise if monitoring and evaluation efforts are being initiated and funded by the company as opposed to civil society groups, affected stakeholders or third parties. A few individuals noted that this may set up a dynamic where engaging stakeholders is seen as a data extraction exercise. Others raised the importance of offsetting any tendency to bury findings that may not



be favorable to the company. This could happen through the evaluation design and company commitments to transparency. The Shift team shared that it would reflect on the ingredients most likely to lead to authentic involvement of affected stakeholders in evaluation. They noted that some of the examples they had identified in research involved communities or civil society groups initiating the evaluation.

Participants also highlighted the importance of trade unions as a critical means of giving voice to workers in a way that might redress power imbalances. Further discussion looked at how the two cases discussed were paying attention to marginalized voices, including the involvement of women. There was also discussion of how to build the trust needed to gain honest feedback from workers (or other affected stakeholders), and how each of the models was supporting that aim.

Participants discussed the fact that interventions of this kind can be resource-intensive. At the same time, by involving affected stakeholders in the evaluation process, companies and their partners can gain much more robust and nuanced evidence of which programs and processes are driving positive change in people's lives, and which of their characteristics are most important in achieving those results. That then enables the confidence to scale the most impactful programs and processes more widely, without needing to invest in the same in-depth feedback in every instance.

The Shift team noted that they would be learning further from these and a range of other models and methodologies they had identified. Some would become case studies, while others may lend themselves to new pilots. The aim would be to highlight models that others could learn from, and which may lend themselves to replication or adaptation in other contexts.

7. Reflections, Recommendations and Next Steps

In the final session, participants were invited to share reflections from the consultation and guidance to the project team going forward. Recommendations included that the team should:

- Set out how the various focal areas and resources interrelate to each other, including how companies and their stakeholders can find the entry points into the work that meet their own needs.
- Share more practical examples of innovations because showing the “art of the possible” can massively reduce the barrier to entry.
- Provide examples and/or explore pilots that address downstream human rights risks, where customers and end use of products and services are of key concern).
- Continue to drive forward the separate workstream on accounting, because once we can seed better evaluation practices, we need to ensure that we capture value erosion and creation for business and society to allow markets to adjust to this new information.

The Shift team noted that they would be holding similar multi-stakeholder consultations later in the year with partners in Central and Eastern Europe, Sub-Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia. Summaries of these discussions would all be available on the [project portal](#). Based on the feedback received, the products from each workstream would be iteratively refined, improved and retested with stakeholders,



until they appeared ready for finalization. The team welcomed any additional feedback participants may wish to share bilaterally over the months ahead.

ANNEX A: OVERVIEW OF FOCAL AREAS

FOCAL AREAS	KEY QUESTION	POTENTIAL OUTPUTS
#1 Current evaluation practice	Are we right that most metrics are fairly superficial and remote from outcomes?	Results of analysis of ratings, rankings, benchmarks and disclosure
#2 Business model risk	What features of business models carry significant and inherent human rights risks?	Summary overview for investors and top leaders, with mitigation options and guidance for teams
#3 Leadership and governance	How do leadership and governance support a culture that respects human rights?	A menu of indicators of rights-respecting leadership and governance
#4 Quality of processes	How can we best devise indicators that go beyond the existence of a process to its quality in delivering results?	Guidance/methodologies/recommendations for improved ways of developing indicators of good human rights policies and processes
#5 Theory of Change Method	How can companies structure robust approaches to evaluating the effectiveness of their efforts to mitigate human rights risk?	A practical and piloted tool that companies can apply to their human rights interventions, individually or collectively with others
#6 Behavioral Science	What lessons can we learn from behavioral science for ways to design and evaluate interventions aimed at embedding key behaviors for respecting human rights?	A range of insights, approaches and results of experiments using behavioral insights that can support effective behavioral change
#7 Stakeholder voice	How can and should stakeholder voices be included in processes of evaluating business respect for human rights?	Case studies and pilots showing ways in which stakeholder voice has been effectively integrated into evaluation processes
#8 Accounting models	How can and should accounting models capture value associated with respect for human rights?	Proposals/recommendations; possibly a tested model around e.g. living wages.

ANNEX B: AGENDA

0830 Arrivals and Breakfast

0900 Welcome, Introductions and Progress

In the opening session, Shift will present our takeaways from the first year of the Valuing Respect project. We will share an overview of key messages from multi-stakeholder consultations in 2018, and how insights from these conversations have informed the direction of the project. We will provide an overview of the research we have completed, our initial outputs and planned products.

0930 A Method for Better Evaluation of Business Respect for Human Rights

Throughout 2019, Shift will be field testing an initial version of the first Valuing Respect product: a theory of change method to develop meaningful indicators for initiatives to prevent and mitigate human rights impacts. In this session, we will present the methodology, demonstrate its application and hear from a company that has started to pilot its use.

We will invite participants to share their reflections regarding:

- Lessons from applying analogous methodologies to indicator design;
- Strengths of the methodology and the range of ways it could be applied in practice;
- Possible limitations and weaknesses of the approach, and how we might address them;
- Opportunities for further field-testing in 2019.

1100 Break

1120 Identifying Human Rights Risks in Business Models

This Valuing Respect workstream explores the possibility of furnishing business leaders, investors and civil society with indicators of risks to people that are inherent in certain features of business models. The goal is to facilitate an early discussion of these risks with (and within) business in order to support decisions that avoid or mitigate them.

Following a brief introduction of our initial draft typology, we will seek inputs about:

- A draft typology with examples of business model risk indicators;
- Weaknesses, gaps or better ways of framing the issues;
- Use-cases for such indicators for business leaders, investors and civil society;
- Recommendations for how we can best progress this work.

1245 Lunch



1330 Indicators of Rights-Respecting Leadership and Governance

The Valuing Respect workstream is developing a set of indicators for rights-respecting leadership and governance that signal a company’s seriousness in making respect for human rights part of how they do business. Shift will present the draft of these indicators as a basis for dialogue among participants to:

- Explore which aspects of leadership and governance are most important to determine whether the right culture, commitments and incentives for progress on human rights are in place;
- Propose edits to the indicator set, considering both indicators of greatest utility inside a company, and those best suited to evaluation from outside a company;
- Discuss options for how to present the final output to support uptake and use by investors, business leaders and civil society.

1500 Break

1520 Engaging Stakeholder Voice in Evaluation: Opportunities, Methods and Case Examples

Evaluating the human rights outcomes of business interventions that aim to address human rights risks will almost always demand engaging with the experience and perspectives of the people who’s human rights those efforts seek to advance. Identifying how to do this in practice and apply lessons/approaches at scale is a critical part of the Valuing Respect project agenda.

In this session, Shift will represent a simple framework, drawing on the discipline of participatory evaluation, for the different ways that affected stakeholders can be involved in the evaluation of business respect for human rights. We will hear from a few practitioners who have been engaging stakeholder voice in the monitoring and evaluation of company programs. The group will then focus on:

- Avenues to build capacity and capability to engage stakeholder voice in evaluation;
- Reactions and recommendations about case studies and stakeholder voice pilots that Shift may undertake over the next year.

1640 Reflections, Recommendations and Next Steps



VALUING RESPECT
— by **Shift** —

ANNEX C: PARTICIPANTS

Adil Rehman	ASOS	Maddelena Negia	FIDH
Alva Bruun	Finland	Marcus Wilert	Hermes
Beata Faracik	PIHRB	Marilyn Croser	CORE
Beck Wallace	Oxfam	Martin Buttle	ETI
Bettina Reinboth	PRI	Mike Ashley	Barclays
Catie Shavin	GBI	Nina Schuler	DFID
Caroline Eriksen	NBIM	Natasha Schwarzback	Pepsi
Dan Neale	CHRB	Paul Druckman	Shift Board
David Bonbright	Keystone Accountability	Pauline Tiffen	Verite
Deniz Utlü	DIMR	Peter Frankenthal	Amnesty
Felicitas Weber	Know the Chain	Rosey Hurst	Impactt
Hannah Clayton	ICMM	Samah Abbasi	GSK
Hannah Shoesmith	Hermes	Sarah Boardman	FCO
Harriet Von Spiegel	Independent	Susanne Stormer	Novo Nordisk
Holger Dreiseitl	Germany AA	Wilhelm Mohn	NBIM
Kaiesha Gibson	Pentland	Caroline Rees	Shift
Kitrhona Cerri	WBCSD	Jana Mudronova	Shift
Lee Risby	C&A Foundation	Francis West	Shift
Louise Nicholls	Independent	Mark Hodge	Shift
Luke Waldron	Barclays		



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