

A photograph of a construction site. In the background, a yellow excavator is positioned next to a red tractor with a trailer. Another red tractor with a trailer is further to the right. The ground is muddy and uneven. In the foreground, several workers are visible. One worker in a blue jacket and a red cap is bent over, working with a tool in the mud. Another worker in a dark blue jacket is also bent over, working with a tool. A third worker in an orange jacket is standing nearby. The scene is set in a muddy, possibly flooded, area. The text "HUMAN RIGHTS AND BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE ANNUAL REPORT 2018" is overlaid in white on the right side of the image.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE ANNUAL REPORT 2018



For over 60 years, The Fund for Peace (FFP) has been a world leader in developing practical tools and approaches for reducing conflict. With a clear focus on the nexus of human security and economic development, FFP contributes to more peaceful and prosperous societies by engineering smarter methodologies and smarter partnerships. FFP empowers policy-makers, practitioners, and populations with context-specific, data-driven applications to diagnose risks and vulnerabilities and to develop solutions through collective dialogue. FFP is an independent tax-exempt non-governmental organization headquartered in Washington, D.C. with offices in Abuja, Nigeria and Tunis, Tunisia. FFP boasts six decades of programmatic experience in over 40 countries, focused on conflict early warning, peacebuilding, and sustainable development.

Copyright © 2019 The Fund for Peace.
All rights reserved.

Cover images copyright J.J. Messner/FFP.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means without prior written consent from The Fund for Peace.

The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the any members of the Human Rights & Business Roundtable.

The Fund for Peace
1101 14th Street NW, Suite 1020
Washington, D.C. 20005
T: +1 202 223 7940
www.fundforpeace.org

CONTENTS

Introduction	4
Constructive Engagement on Human Rights & Business	5
About the Human Rights & Business Roundtable ...	6
Supporters of the Human Rights and Business Roundtable	7
Roundtable Presenters in 2018	8
Roundtable #138: In-Country Implementation Challenges and Opportunities	9
Roundtable #139: Mitigating Gender-Based Violence in Natural Resources Sectors	11
Roundtable #140: Perspectives on Responsible Business Practices in Challenging Contexts ...	13
Roundtable #141: Addressing Human Trafficking and Forced Labor in Supply Chains	15
About Fund for Peace	17
Fund for Peace in the Field	19

INTRODUCTION

In 2018, the Human Rights and Business Roundtable looked significantly different to when it was first launched in 1996 as the Foreign Policy Roundtable, demonstrating not only how far the Roundtable itself has come in over two decades, but also highlighting through its content and focus areas just how much the practice of business and human rights, particularly in regard to security, has also progressed. Two decades ago, the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights (VPSHR) was merely the beginning of a concept discussed within the confines of forums such as the Human Rights and Business Roundtable. And now, it is a flourishing initiative that is being systematically implemented in countries around the world. Testament to this is the Roundtable's focus during 2019 on in-country processes, such as Ghana, Nigeria, and Peru. The Roundtable also looked at Gender-Based Violence (GBV), human trafficking, and responsible business practices in challenging political contexts.

Though much about the Roundtable has changed in the last 22 years, its core principle remains the same — bringing together diverse stakeholders to constructively discuss critical human rights and development issues in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect. When the Roundtable was created in 1996, the field of business and human rights was considerably different to what it is now. There was nowhere near the level of engagement — let alone constructive engagement — that exists between companies and civil society today. Where communication did exist, it was more frequently adversarial, rather than constructive in search of practical solutions.

We trust that the Roundtable has contributed to the strengthening relationships between diverse, multisector groups, such as between the private sector and civil society. It is important that a light be shone on areas of concern, or worse, wrongdoing. It is necessary that we cast a critical eye on business operations, particularly where they have the potential to affect communities in fragile environments. But being critical is comparatively easy. What takes real effort and hard

work is building bridges with other stakeholders, and not allowing perfect to become the enemy of the good. The true utility of the Roundtable has been demonstrated in providing a safe space for finding practical solutions to very real problems that require the cooperation and collaboration of stakeholders of all sectors, government, corporate, and civil society.

The Roundtable has also fostered our own role in collaborating with companies to help them address their own complex security challenges, and as a result, hopefully create safer and more sustainable environments for affected communities. Though NGO collaboration with companies may be commonplace now, it was not always so. The Roundtable allowed FFP to be able to build up trust over many years to the point where we were comfortable enough to partner and collaborate with companies. At the time, when FFP was one of the pioneering NGOs to partner with oil, gas, and mining companies, we were harshly criticized, perhaps most vociferously within our own sector. But now, the reality is very different, and multi-stakeholder collaborative activities have gone from being criticized to even celebrated.

As we look forward to 2019, we will seek to continue to innovate, both in terms of the subject matter we examine and the relationships we seek to build. We are immensely proud of the achievements of the Roundtable that, though perhaps not evident at the time, are abundantly clear over two decades years hence.

J.J. Messner

*Executive Director, The Fund for Peace
Chair, Human Rights & Business Roundtable*

CONSTRUCTIVE ENGAGEMENT ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND BUSINESS

Plenty of attention has been placed on problems and shortcomings in the practices and operations of corporations around the world, be it in regard to community relations, environmental concerns, human rights, labor rights, or security. Many activists rightly expect and demand that corporations address these concerns and improve their practices. However, companies often lack the necessary expertise or experience in executing and implementing certain specialized programs. For example, a large oil company can be very effective at exploration, drilling, and production but lacks a staff of trained experts to advise on issues related to security and human rights.

Even beyond expertise, companies may often struggle to convene necessary stakeholders, such as local community groups, NGOs, human rights commissions, and other groups that may not necessarily be forthcoming towards corporations. Thus, there is a need for a trusted organizations with convening power to assist with establishing such dialogues. FFP has been engaged in a wide array of programs that have assisted companies in the oil, mining, and agribusiness sectors, including:

- Assessments (including Community, Human Rights Impacts, Risk, Security);
- Training on Human Rights and Security for companies, communities, and security forces;
- Technical support for human rights monitors;
- Expert advice on implementation;
- Community/stakeholder engagement;
- Workshops on security and human rights for a variety of stakeholders.

FFP was one of the very first (and continues to be one of very few) non-profit NGOs that is willing to partner with corporations to assist them with implementation projects that can take high-level security and human rights concepts, ideals, and obligations, and apply them on-



Image: J.J. Messner/FFP

the-ground. FFP continues to be a leader in this field, known for a multistakeholder and inclusive approach, as well as being renowned for innovative and responsive in program design and implementation. FFP has experience implementing these programs in Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, Laos, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Spain, Turkey, and Western Sahara. FFP has been a leader in the field of company-NGO cooperation on security and human rights implementation, with a number of notable achievements. One of the best known projects was where FFP assisted the Cameroonian military in improving their human rights training program, ensuring that the program was context specific and accompanied by materials that would be more likely to appeal to, and resonate with, soldiers — in this case, comic books. FFP continues to employ an innovative and inclusive approach that focuses on finding contextual, practical solutions to affect change.

ABOUT THE HUMAN RIGHTS AND BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE

At the time of its launch in 1996, there was a growing global movement of activists that recognized problems and shortcomings in the practices and operations of corporations around the world, be it in regard to environmental concerns, labor rights, or security. Though there was a rapidly increasing level of coverage of these issues, a lack of dialogue between stakeholders existed; activists and companies viewed each other as adversaries, and rarely (if ever) engaged with one another. The idea that activists and corporations would even be comfortable in the same room together was a somewhat alien concept, such was the culture at the time of mutual mistrust. Though there was much legitimacy behind many of the claims made by the activist community, there was minimal focus on actually affecting change that could address the problems that were being highlighted. After all, it is difficult to find solutions if the problems themselves are not even discussed in the first place.

In 1996, FFP sought to address this gap in stakeholder communication and understanding by convening the Human Rights & Business Roundtable. The Roundtable was one of the very first forums to bring together stakeholders from the business and NGO communities to discuss issues of concern in an environment of trust and mutual respect.

As the Roundtable progressed in its formative years, it was discovered that the issues faced by the oil and mining industries, along with the high level of willingness to engage by the companies from those industries, led the Roundtable to focus specifically on that sector. Eventually, other key stakeholders were introduced into the dialogue, including government agencies (both American and foreign), military, aid and development agencies, multilateral institutions, and academia.

Nearly two decades later, the Roundtable continues to provide a forum for exchange and understanding between multiple, diverse stakeholder groups on a wide range of issues. Meeting every two



Image: Stock

months in Washington, D.C. (with many others calling in from around the world), the Roundtables focus on issues as wide-ranging as security and human rights, indigenous rights, sustainable livelihoods, conflict-free supply chains, grievance mechanisms, and measuring impact of implementation. Though the focus of the Roundtable continues to be the oil and mining industries, it is currently expanding to include sectors that face similar challenges, such as agriculture, construction, and renewable energy, among others.

Though the impact of the Roundtable is often indirect and hard to quantify, the evolution of the discussion on security, rights, and development issues over the past two decades is unmistakable. The Roundtable also provided the seed for the Voluntary Principles on Security & Human Rights, an international initiative that now boasts nearly ten governments and 30 multinational corporations.



SUPPORTERS OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS AND BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE

The Fund for Peace is grateful for the continuing support of the Supporters of the Human Rights & Business Roundtable.

Premier Supporter of the Human Rights & Business Roundtable

CHEVRON

Supporters of the Human Rights & Business Roundtable

BARRICK GOLD

EXXONMOBIL

FREEMONT-MCMORAN

KOSMOS ENERGY

NEWMONT MINING

Participants of the Human Rights & Business Roundtable

Access Health Worldwide	Devonshire Initiative	Inter-American Dialogue	Oxfam America
Afghan American Chamber of Commerce	DLA Piper	International Finance Corporation	PAE
Africa Expert Network	Earthworks	International Senior Lawyers Association	Partners Global
Amazon Conservation Association	Embassy of Australia	International Stability Operations Association	Pax Mondial
American Bar Association Rule of Law Initiative	Equitable Origin	IO Sustainability	Pepper Hamilton
Arcadia University	ExxonMobil	Kinross	Prospectors and Developers Association of Canada
BP	First Peoples Worldwide	McCain Institute	Resolve
Cardno Emerging Markets	GardaWorld	MSI Integrity	RioTinto
CARE	Gemological Institute of America	National Defense University	Shell
Citi	George Washington University	National Democratic Institute	U.N. Association
Climate Nexus	Global Affairs Canada	National Geospatial Intelligence Agency	Universal Human Rights Network
Compliance Advisor Ombudsman, World Bank	Goldcorp	New Gold	U.S. Department of State
Conservation International	Hess	Noble Energy	World Bank
Deloitte	Human Analytics	Organization of American States	
	Interaction		
	Inter-American Development Bank		

HUMAN RIGHTS AND BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE PRESENTERS IN 2018

The Fund for Peace would like to thank the following experts (including many coming to the Roundtable from far and wide) for their contributions in leading and facilitating the Roundtable discussions in 2018:

Joel Bisina
Executive Director
LITE-Africa

Hannah Blyth
Programs Manager
The Fund for Peace

Alan Bryden
Assistant Director and Head of Public-Private Partnerships Division
Geneva Center for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces

Adriana Eftimie
Senior Operation Officer/Social Development Specialist
International Finance Corporation

Nick Forster
Senior Vice President
FSI Worldwide

James Gyenes
International Relations Officer
U.S. Department of Labor

Katherine Heller
Senior Gender Specialist Consultant
International Finance Corporation

Emily Holland
Associate
White & Case

Marco Konings
Director, Social & Environmental Impact Management
Cardno International Development

J.J. Messner
Executive Director
The Fund for Peace

Carlos Salazar
Executive Director
Socios Peru

IN-COUNTRY IMPLEMENTATION: CHALLENGES, LESSONS AND OPPORTUNITIES

ROUNDTABLE #138: MARCH 12, 2018

This Roundtable focused on the implementation of the Voluntary Principles on Security & Human Rights (VPSHR) within diverse country contexts. Three panelists shared experiences of implementing the VPSHR in Ghana, Nigeria and Peru. They discussed the establishment of working groups and in-country processes within each respective nation, sharing the progress these groups have made and the obstacles they have faced. The discussions highlighted the challenges in bringing relevant stakeholders to the same table, but also emphasized the collective benefit for all parties of doing so. While the experiences, challenges and adaptive strategies varied from country to country, the event provided stakeholders with a valuable opportunity to learn from the successes and setbacks of the panelists and consider them within the context of their own situation.



Image: Hannah Blyth/FFP

The speakers emphasized the importance of good governance within the security sector and in developing sustainable national and locally driven, multi-stakeholder agendas on human rights issues. The questions posed to the panel were as follows:

1. What are the main challenges, both political and technical, of a national working group?
2. What are your main successes and what does success mean for a national working group?

Ghana

The panelist began by giving a brief background on the VPSHR in Ghana. Ghana was the first African nation to sign up for the VPSHR in 2014, and the country now has one of the most developed VPSHR infrastructures. The panelist then went on to explain that, despite

progress, the in-country working group in Ghana remains relatively young and one of the main challenges facing the group has been addressing the knowledge gap regarding the VPSHR. For example, civil society organizations were not fully aware of the potential the VPSHR have to bring about inter-stakeholder dialogue. It was also difficult to engage and connect all the relevant actors, in particular government ministries. It was noted, however, that the armed forces were receptive to the VPSHR and have begun to implement training programs addressing the VPSHR since the army's engagement with the in-country working group. It was further detailed that through this training process, the knowledge gap is beginning to be filled and people are beginning to feel a personal investment in the VPSHR. An anecdote was shared of a civil service strike, where on the day of said strike the majority of civil servants still attended a roundtable on the VPSHR. It was also noted that progress has been made in discussions with actors in the oil and gas sector in Ghana. The panelist highlighted

that success was not just bringing relevant stakeholders to the same table, but progressing to a point of tangible change.

Nigeria

The panelist from a Nigerian civil society organization opened by giving a background to his organization's engagement with the VPSHR in Nigeria. It was explained that the working group in Nigeria is still young, having been founded in mid-2017. The panelist spoke of the difficulty of promoting the VPSHR, and human rights more broadly, within a context of insecurity and insurgency. As a result, certain government stakeholders were viewed at times as being unreceptive to the cause. An anecdote was shared about a government minister who failed to see the relevance of human rights when they were fighting Boko Haram. The story demonstrated a knowledge gap regarding human rights and a level of disconnect between stakeholders.

The panelist identified the working group's primary success as facilitating cross-pillar communication, where stakeholders were coming to the table to engage with one another rather than to 'name and shame.' However, in spite of the progress made in engaging relevant actors, there remains a capacity gap that has prevented the actualization of ideas that would consolidate the VPSHR in Nigeria.

Peru

The panelist began with a background of working groups in Peru. Mining-related working groups have been present in Peru for nearly seven years, and have held large multi-stakeholder forums in Lima and Cusco in the past. Working groups have also engaged with police and state security forces, working together to facilitate human rights training for security personnel. The panelist shared the difficulties of getting the relevant stakeholders to engage with each other; it was necessary that each stakeholder 'really wanted to be there.' Therefore, conveying the importance of the VPs and how they relate to conflict mitigation was key to ensuring personal investment in the process. The panelist highlighted the importance of gaining enthusiasm and buy-in from police and other security forces to encourage progress.

The panelist further identified a scarcity of time and resources as another challenging aspect facing the working group in Peru. He asserted that many corporate representatives could not find the time

to come to Peru and engage with the process. Funding the group's activities was also a challenge within Peru. The panelist believes that success could be achieved through learning from the success and failures of each other's strategies and considering them within their own regional context.

Discussion

Following the panel discussions there was a question and answer session. The first question related to the pressure placed on working groups to find success quickly. The participant shared an experience from Colombia where multi-stakeholder dialogue with FARC had continued for a very long time due to the difficulties in keeping relevant actors at the table. The question was asked whether our expectations with regards to time frame need to be adjusted.

Another participant brought up the issue of the VPSHR working group in Myanmar. It was briefly noted that this group is in the early stages of formation but is facing challenges in engaging the civil society and government sectors as they currently have alternative strategic priorities.

The importance of bringing relevant stakeholders to the same table was again stressed, as was the importance of translating that into tangible impact. All panelists highlighted the importance of mutual exchange of knowledge and experiences as a key tool for developing working groups in the future.

Report by Oliver Chandler and Lauren Jesch

This meeting summary is intended to provide an overview of the discussion and is not intended to be a formal record of proceedings. None of the views expressed represent the formal or official views or position of any specific organization. Statements or opinions by any presenter or participant in this meeting are non-attributable.

MITIGATING GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE RISKS IN NATURAL RESOURCES SECTORS

ROUNDTABLE #139: JUNE 20, 2018

Implicit within international best practices for business and human rights is the need to identify and mitigate risks of human rights abuses in the workplace. Women, who are already disproportionately impacted by conflict and violence, are often at risk of sexual harassment and assault by security forces within communities and in work sites, and face other forms of gender-based discrimination and stigmas as well. While the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights (VPs) guide companies on undertaking human rights risk assessments, the VPs do not explicitly highlight gender concerns.

This roundtable explored how companies in the natural resources sector are approaching gender-based violence in their risk assessment processes, as well as how civil society and governments are working to address broader security sector reform and social barriers around the issue.

As both large-scale multinational and artisanal, smaller-scale extractives companies proliferate throughout the developing world, it is important to examine their impact on the communities in which they operate, and particularly the effects – both positive and negative – on women in those communities. For example, while the start of an extractives operation can result in an influx of cash bringing development and employment, operations may also create tensions and conditions contributing to a higher prevalence of alcohol use and prostitution, the spread of HIV/AIDS and STDs, as well as sexual violence and unwanted pregnancies. Another common consequence of mining is land degradation and deforestation, which forces women and girls – who are most often the ones responsible for agriculture and collecting firewood – to commute farther from home to engage in these activities. As a result, women and girls become more vulnerable to violence.



Image: Solidarity Center/Flickr CC

In addition, many women working in the extractives industry face gender-based discrimination and stigmas which limit their opportunities. In some communities women working in mines are believed to bring bad luck, or are perceived to be less hardworking than men and more deserving of lower-paying jobs. While women may gain greater financial independence through their work in the mining sector, this independence may result in feelings of emasculation among men which results in a spike in domestic violence. On a practical level, some mining sites are poorly equipped to include and protect female employees, by lacking separate facilities for women.

In short, the extractives industry can provide significant financial opportunities for women, but only if it is made inclusive to women and is managed according to a set of principles that acknowledge the industry's responsibilities around gender-based violence in the

workplace and in the communities in which it operates.

The Role of Companies in Addressing Gender-Based Violence (GBV)

The roundtable discussion focused on the ways extractives companies can, and should, play a role in reducing gender-based violence (GBV) within local communities. Of concern to companies as business entities, GBV can result in high costs that negatively impact business operations. For example, GBV is correlated with higher rates of absenteeism, low worker productivity, and high employee turnover, factors that jeopardize productivity. Working to reduce incidents of GBV within the company and the local community not only increases the quality of life for local women and girls but can also benefit the company by decreasing the costs associated with sexual harassment lawsuits, settlements, and low productivity.

One of the roundtable presentations urged companies to address GBV in the workplace by creating an employee code of conduct as well as implementing clear policies for involving law enforcement, for filing complaints, and for dealing with false accusations. The issue of implementing fair and equitable practices that minimize GBV in company supply chains also emerged as an issue of importance. Even if a company does not directly employ women in the company's mining operations, it is important to consider the women and girls affected by GBV in their supply chains and in the communities. Small-scale mining and other natural resource operations typically have significant influence and power in local communities as they can be the sole source of employment for families who depend on the mining industry to feed their families. As a result, these companies can help influence norms and set precedents in communities to help reduce GBV.

One challenge companies face is balancing the enforcement of a code of conduct within the workplace with trying to support GBV prevention in spheres outside of the company, like domestic or community spaces. The use of toolkits uniquely designed to help companies navigate issues like GBV in the extractive industry, including financial toolkits, have emerged as a mechanism to incentivize company involvement while directly benefiting local communities.

Challenges and Opportunities for Mitigating GBV in Real-World Scenarios

One case study that was featured in the roundtable was that of Rwanda, where several NGOs are actively working to improve professionalism, transparency, profitability, and accessibility for women in artisanal and small-scale mines (ASMs). In the country as a whole, cultural norms often limit the extent to which women can contribute to ASM work and many of the negative impacts of the ASM industry, like degradation of timber and arable land, fall disproportionately on women. However, regions of Rwanda like the Gakenke district, which has 8% more women working in ASM than Rwanda's average, report more productivity, less GBV, and more financially sustainable households. Overall, mining companies that have employed women have seen an increase in productivity and health standards.

Discussion during the roundtable presentations also cited the examples of Papua New Guinea and D.R. Congo, where NGO and multilateral institution-led initiatives have helped corporations promote anti-GBV principles and codes of conduct, trainings, stronger and better-connected local governmental institutions, and clearer reporting procedures for sexual misconduct. Addressing culturally entrenched perceptions of GBV and the treatment of women was also highlighted as being critical; discussants pointed to the success of messaging that was tailored specifically to men and appealed to their culture or masculinity as arguments against GBV.

Finally, a salient challenge facing the mitigation of GBV in the ASM industry is the depth and breadth of supply chains; it was noted that oftentimes, miners in Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, and the DRC operate as loose networks of teams or use sub- and sub-sub-contractors, making consistent enforcement of anti-GBV principles difficult.

Report by Diana Kelley, Giovanna de Miranda, and Joshua Zakharov

This meeting summary is intended to provide an overview of the discussion and is not intended to be a formal record of proceedings. None of the views expressed represent the formal or official views or position of any specific organization. Statements or opinions by any presenter or participant in this meeting are non-attributable.

PERSPECTIVES ON RESPONSIBLE BUSINESS PRACTICES IN CHALLENGING CONTEXTS

ROUNDTABLE #140: OCTOBER 23, 2018

The decision whether to operate or not operate in a country can be simpler in some industries than in others. In the extractives sector, companies do not have the luxury of choosing where the resources exist - and the experience of the past decades has shown that valuable resources such as minerals and hydrocarbons are frequently found under the soil of countries that have challenging political, social, and conflict dynamics. As expectations grow for businesses to commit to responsible business practices, particularly in fragile and conflict-affected situations, the drive to meet these expectations can sometimes clash with the prevailing political conditions on the ground. How can companies ensure responsible practices while operating in these complex environments? This Roundtable will explore how companies can uphold their commitments to responsible business practices in complex political environments.

The key issue raised during the discussion was the entrenchment of the political power structure in some countries, and the unavoidable risks that poses for operating transparently. With respect for human rights and the rule of law underpinning responsible business practices, operating in a state that has widespread reports of violations and a lack of separation between the executive and judiciary, presents significant implementation challenges. For example, the existence of meaningful civic space is needed for public accountability and transparency; without this, initiatives such as the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) cannot function effectively in practice.

The discussion identified several recommendations and potential entry points for key stakeholders operating in a country. These recommendations and entry points include:

- Establishing a company specific human resources offices to



Image: J.J. Messner/FFP

manage recruitment can reduce the risks posted by human trafficking in the supply chain, and entrenched nepotism within the Government controlled employment agencies.

- Training and support to the in-country EITI and working with the IMF and other partners to ensure that any government application process to EITI is tied to meaningful progress, such as real civil society engagement.
- Engagement with local CSOs to build capacity and encourage civic space. One entry point identified was by working with local groups to focusing on entrepreneurship and economic empowerment as part of CSR programming.
- Engagement with the banking sector to tackle wider corruption through financial flows.

Report by Hannah Blyth

Page left intentionally blank.

ADDRESSING HUMAN TRAFFICKING AND FORCED LABOR IN SUPPLY CHAINS

ROUNDTABLE #141: NOVEMBER 15, 2018

This Roundtable focused on Human Trafficking and Forced Labor in Supply Chains looked at questions of supply chain management as well as to what extent different sectors are responsible for preventing human trafficking and forced labor. The roundtable specifically touched on the role of the private sector in awareness and prevention of human trafficking and forced labor in their supply chains. The discussion also explored the role of technology and its impact on preventing human rights abuses in supply chains. Although many positive steps forward have been made in recent years, there are still gaps that exist in efforts to eradicate human trafficking and forced labor in supply chains.



Image: Pixabay/sammisreachers

Consumers, shareholders and company employees can wield tremendous power in shaping company actions and focusing attention on human rights abuses, including labor practices, in a company's operations. In recent years this has been demonstrated in shareholder activism and the growing voice of the Millennial generation in calling out companies for poor practices. While some brands may not feel it is their responsibility to investigate their supply chains for human trafficking or forced labor, public pressure from activists and consumers can still influence company actions in a desire to protect their brand and public image. In addition, employees may leverage their roles to try to affect change from the inside and persuade companies to investigate human rights abuses in their supply chains.

The Role of Technology

Technology can play a crucial role in reporting, monitoring and spreading awareness of human rights abuses in supply chains. For example, applications created by the U.S. Department of Labor such as Sweat & Toil and Comply Chain provide stakeholders with research and best practices to reduce child/forced labor in supply chains. Meanwhile, blockchain technology has the potential to be useful for vulnerable and disenfranchised groups to create virtual identities when documentation is hard to come by, deal with employment disputes, and form a digital footprint or radio tags. Furthermore, the use of satellite monitoring and supply chain management software has proven to be helpful to understand the prominence of human and labor rights abuses in supply chains. With the spread of mobile technology, businesses and employers are increasingly able to offer creative and accessible solutions to protect

human rights, such as developing worker helpline channels that can be accessed via Facebook Messenger, SMS, or toll-free numbers.

However, while technology can offer useful tools to companies, governments, consumers, and other stakeholders, the speakers at the roundtable cautioned against an over-reliance on technological solutions. It is critical to continue having people physically on the ground, conducting research and monitoring cases of forced labor and trafficking.

Remaining Challenges

Efforts to prevent forced labor and human trafficking in supply chains continue to face barriers to success and gaps in enforcement. However, the roundtable presenters highlighted several ways in which governments, civil society and corporations are seeking to address these gaps.

One area where problems often arise is in companies' attempts to perform local due diligence in their recruitment processes on the ground, as companies may face barriers such as language and cultural differences and be working with a third-party recruiter. However, companies can make a concerted effort to be more engaged in source countries, taking charge of recruitment processes to ensure better oversight.

In a legal context, business lawyers are increasingly pursuing alternative means to assert human rights claims against corporations. An example of this is through the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, which provides tools to combat trafficking in persons both worldwide and domestically. However, while investor interest in human rights compliance is growing, an issue that arises is that human rights is not fully reflected in the market or correlated with the cost of capital.

In an effort to improve coordination between disparate actors, networks are increasingly forming to encourage governments and civil society groups to work collaboratively with the private sector. An example of this that was cited is Myanmar's garment manufacturing industry, where there has been a mainstream push for the eradication of child labor. As a result, the garment industry has not only seen improvements in child labor, but also in working conditions and gender equality.

It was also noted that governments play a critical role in addressing

gaps and enforcing labor and anti-trafficking laws; however, governments can also be complicit in many labor rights violations. In these cases, companies have an important role to play in moving beyond "tick the box" exercises in human rights benchmarking to ensure meaningful implementation and enforcement, while the international community and civil society groups can continue to exert pressure and raise awareness on labor violations.

Over time, there has been a positive evolution of the regulatory environment along with increased tools and enforcement mechanisms to combat human rights abuses in supply chains; however, gaps and challenges remain. If all stakeholders continue to work both collaboratively and individually, and leverage their networks and technological innovations, to agree on strategies and best practices for strengthening compliance, progress toward the eradication of labor rights abuses in supply chains may continue.

Report by Kayla Henrichsen and Esaba Hoque

This meeting summary is intended to provide an overview of the discussion and is not intended to be a formal record of proceedings. None of the views expressed represent the formal or official views or position of any specific organization. Statements or opinions by any presenter or participant in this meeting are non-attributable.

ABOUT FUND FOR PEACE

For over 60 years, Fund for Peace (FFP) has been a world leader in developing practical tools and approaches for reducing conflict. With a clear focus on the nexus of human security and economic development, FFP contributes to more peaceful and prosperous societies by engineering smarter methodologies and smarter partnerships. FFP empowers policy-makers, practitioners, and populations with context-specific, data-driven applications to diagnose risks and vulnerabilities and to develop solutions through collective dialogue. FFP is an independent tax-exempt non-governmental organization headquartered in Washington, D.C. with offices in Abuja, Nigeria and Tunis, Tunisia. FFP boasts six decades of programmatic experience in over 40 countries, focused on conflict early warning, peacebuilding, and sustainable development.

* * *

Fund for Peace was established in San Francisco in 1957 by Randolph P. Compton and his wife Dorothy Danforth in memory of their son, John Parker Compton, who was killed in action while serving with the U.S. Army's 10th Mountain Division in the Italian Alps during World

War II. In the wake of their son's death in combat, the Comptons sought to pursue a more peaceful world and as such created FFP as a think tank and philanthropic foundation with the mission of supporting research and advocacy on issues that advanced the agenda of peace.

At the time of its creation, FFP was primarily focused on the most pressing issue of the Cold War era — nuclear non-proliferation. As the challenges facing our world have shifted over the decades, so too have our approaches and programming. In the beginning, FFP's role was as a philanthropic funder of a variety of organizations committed to nuclear non-proliferation. With the fall of the Berlin Wall and an end to the Cold War, FFP re-evaluated its mission and purpose, and emerged as an implementing organization dedicated to responding to the challenges weak and fragile states. Today, FFP is focused on understanding and addressing issues of violent conflict, state fragility, and security and human rights. We work with a variety of partners in government, multilateral organizations, security forces, foundations, corporations, civil society organizations, and local communities in dozens of countries around the world.

SMARTER APPROACHES TO A COMPLEX WORLD

WE DEVELOP TOOLS AND METRICS



Fragile and Conflict
Affected States



Contextual Risk Tools



Data for Peace



Conflict Early Warning and
Response



Preventing Election
Violence

WE EMPOWER STAKEHOLDERS



Responsible Business
Practices



Security Assessments and
Guidance



Convening Mutli-
Stakeholder Initiatives



Preventing Gender-Based
Violence



Combatting Violent
Extremism

WE HELP DIVERSE STAKEHOLDERS



Contextual Risk
Assessments



Security Standard
Compliance



Security Risk Assessments



Training



Publicly Available Data

OUR WORK IN THE FIELD

Right: Conflict Assessment workshop in Kenya.

Below: Violence Against Women & Girls Workshop in Nigeria.

Far Below Left: Community focus group in Mali.

Far Below Right: Interviews with traditional leaders in Cote d'Ivoire.



Left: CAST training.
Below: Security and human rights assessment in Cameroon.



Above: Community Engagement in Papua New Guinea.

Right: Multi-stakeholder human rights dialogues in Ghana.





www.fundforpeace.org